

The Inquirer.

A Journal of Liberal Religious Thought and Life.

ESTABLISHED IN 1842.]

[REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER.

No. 3428.
NEW SERIES, No. 532.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1908.

[ONE PENNY.

CONTENTS

NOTES OF THE WEEK	145
LEADER :—	
A True Mission	152
ARTICLE :—	
Our Great Problem—Discussion	153
PROVINCIAL LETTER :—	
The Midlands	157
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Hegelianism and Common Sense	147
On a Criticism by Professor Upton	148
New Theology and Free Will	149
Self-Determination	149
Licensing Legislation	150
The Van Mission	153
LITERATURE :—	
Articles in the Reviews	150
Fideism	156
OBITUARY :—	
Mrs. Shepherd	151
THE CHILDREN'S COLUMN	151
NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES	158
OUR CALENDAR	159
ADVERTISEMENTS	159

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

WE have received from Dr. Tudor Jones, of Wellington, New Zealand, a series of four articles on "Closed and Open Pathways to Religion," which will very soon appear in these columns. The Wellington congregation, at an enthusiastic meeting on Jan. 16, decided to secure a site for the building of a church, and is bravely facing the heavy expenditure which this will involve. A men's Unitarian Club has recently been formed, which, it is hoped, will become a real power in the city.

THE members of the Foreign Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association had the pleasure at their meeting on Tuesday afternoon of greeting Mr. V. A. Sukhtankar on the eve of his return to India. Mr. Sukhtankar, it will be remembered, was formerly the Brahmo student at Manchester College, Oxford, and for the last two years has been pursuing his studies in Germany, first at Kiel and latterly at Bonn. There he recently took the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with distinction, Sanscrit having been the special subject of his study. The Rev. V. D. Davis, the chairman, on behalf of the Committee, congratulated Mr. Sukhtankar on the distinction he had achieved, and offered to him the heartiest good wishes for his future career in India.

THE Evangelical Free Church Council has been meeting in Southport this week, under the presidency of the Rev. David Brook, who was the first Nonconformist

to take an Oxford D.C.L. He belonged to the United Methodist Free Church, and was a leading spirit in securing the union which last year established the United Methodist Church. Dr. Rendel Harris, last year's president, introduced him, and Dr. Brook, in his address, paid a warm tribute to the late Dr. John Watson, who had been elected to that office. Next year's president is to be the Rev. Evan Jones, of Carnarvon, a Calvinistic Methodist. The Council, which was attended by some 2,000 delegates, passed resolutions in cordial support of the Government Education and Licensing Bills, and dealt with many other questions of public interest. The President's address was modest and full of good matter. Its most distinctive note was of the "Mother-spirit" which should animate the Church, following in the footsteps of the Good Shepherd.

DR. C. J. RIDGEWAY, the new Bishop of Chichester, was enthroned on Thursday week, and received at the same time a very cordial welcome from the civic authorities of Chichester. After the enthronement the bishop preached a sermon from the text: "I am among you as he that serveth," and as a lowly follower of Jesus Christ pledged himself to the spirit of personal consecration, of brotherly sympathy, and of association and co-operation. Continuity of history, he said would avail them nothing, unless they had continuity of work and of spirit. It was all summed up in the words, "Your servants for Christ's sake." Of party spirit he spoke with severe condemnation, and appealed to them all for loyalty to Christ and His church.

THE Licensing Bill introduced by Mr. Asquith last week foreshadows substantial reforms. The contemplated large reduction in the number of public-houses will lessen the temptations to drink; although Mr. Balfour says not, the instinct of "the trade" is truer, and the present raging and tearing propaganda from that side shows a wholesome fear of diminished profits. Of course, the brewers' alarm has another and very important cause in the proposal to limit the continuing validity of the old licences to a period of fourteen years, all licences thereafter to be strictly annual. Seeing that the highest tribunals had declared, prior to Mr. Balfour's recent Licensing Act, that licences were actually and not merely in form annual, and not perpetual, and that what "the trade" bought and sold was no more than a speculative probability of renewal, it is surely an act of grace towards the interests involved that they

should have fourteen years in which to adopt methods of self-indemnification. The influential minority on Lord Peel's commission, including Lord Peel himself, recommended seven years as a fair period. Some period, certainly, must be fixed; the claim to a perpetual monopoly, now being put forward, is simply preposterous.

WE have not space, nor is the task necessary here, to deal with the many important provisions included in the Bill which add to its value, although they undoubtedly increase its perils as a candidate for enactment. They refer to such matters as clubs, the employment or presence of young persons in licensed premises, "travellers," limitation of hours on Sundays, and so on. Many of these matters are beyond question ripe for legislation, and if vast financial interests were not at stake, there is no doubt an overwhelming force of public opinion would be favourable to the lines of action indicated. As it is, we must be prepared for, though we must lament, the influences that blind the judgment and increase passion. There is surely a great opportunity now for the display of true patriotism, irrespective of party, on the part of all lovers of decency, sobriety, and national character. We rejoice to see that great leaders in the English Church have boldly declared in favour of the principles of the Bill. A terrible responsibility, indeed, would be theirs if for political reasons they should oppose, or even but coldly countenance, a measure of such far-reaching significance to the personal and home-life of our people. The more they are provoked by the Education Bill the more they are called upon to rise superior to resentment, and to take a prominent share in the great battle which is before us, on behalf of a great step towards social salvation.

AS was to be expected, the suggested Education law is being strongly denounced in many quarters, the lead being taken by clericals and their close allies. Of course there is an outcry against the stipulation that those who wish to preserve strict denominational teaching in their schools must contribute substantially (though far less than formerly) to the cost of maintenance; indeed, claims which were not within the wildest dreams of denominationalists a few years ago are now put coolly forward in the name of indisputable right. Moderate-minded men are clearly of opinion that Mr. McKenna's Bill marks the utmost limit to which public policy allows concessions to be made to sectarians, and the conviction is finding utterance

far and wide that if this attempt at compromise fails, the Gordian knot must be cut by the "secular solution." In spite of omens, it may be that, recoiling from a change so drastic and fraught with such serious possibilities, a sufficient body of support will be found for the Bill, at least for its cardinal principles.

A WHITE paper issued by the Foreign Office gives correspondence on the opium question in China, from which it appears that the export of opium from India into China is to be reduced by 5,100 chests yearly, beginning from January 1, 1908. The diminution is to continue for three years, on the understanding that if during this period the Chinese Government shall have duly carried out on its part arrangements for reducing the production and consumption of opium in China, His Majesty's Government undertakes to continue the annual diminution in the same proportion as during the three years of trial. The import of Persian and other foreign opiums is to be diminished in corresponding ratio; but the Indian Government is instructed to enforce its restrictive measures without insisting on prior fulfilment by others of their part in the agreement.

TWENTY leading Congregationalists recently put forth a manifesto, obviously as a counterblast to the "New Theology." Why the signatories should have been confined to chairman and ex-chairmen of the Congregational Union, with a few heads of colleges thrown in, is difficult to understand, unless the utterance was intended to have an unmistakably *ex cathedra* significance. The manifesto consists of Seven Articles of Faith and a preamble, wherein the purpose of the manifesto is said to be to allay "the theological unrest which has invaded the churches." But it is also of the nature of a vindication, for it says further that it wishes "to assure fellow-Christians of other communions that we hold fast 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints.'" It also makes bold to add that it is issued in the interests of progressive theology. These latter statements are somewhat hard to reconcile, for a faith "once for all delivered" has about it an air of finality which is not exactly consistent with progress. The signatories of the manifesto appear to ignore the universality of the progressive and modernist movement of theological thought, of which all this theological unrest may be a very happy and hopeful sign. If that be so, why try to stem the tide? There crept into the recent controversy personalities, which were "not convenient," a bitterness which ill became those who wore the name Christian. These alone are the regrettable features of such a movement. For "progressive" theologians, these Seven Articles appear remarkably conservative. It is impossible to conceive that their enunciation can advance by one iota any real progressive movement.

As was to have been expected, Mr. Campbell replies to the manifesto. He could have afforded to have left it severely alone. But with every justification he says, "It is the counterpart of the Papal

Encyclical recently issued against the Modernists, and will prove equally futile. The movement against which it is directed cannot be crushed by any such *ex cathedra* utterance. Some of the gentlemen who have signed this manifesto have previously tried after the most approved methods of the Church of Rome what violent personal abuse could do. They are even now trying what practical excommunication can do. But they cannot allay the unrest they deplore, for it is of God. It is a shaking of dry bones in the valley of death. It is the resurgence of faith. It is the revival of Christianity. Great is truth, and it shall prevail." Mr. Campbell's allusions are, obviously, to the boycott of advanced men in his body from Congregational platforms, and this week from the Free Church Council meetings at Southport.

A WELL-KNOWN nursery song has for its moral "Never ask any more than you're likely to get." This advice, meanwhile, does not exclude a liberal calculation of the probabilities. It is said that the Rev. Dr. Aked, some weeks ago, gave his people a warm lecture for running behind with their current account, and then said he wanted seven thousand dollars to put things right, and wanted it before they left the church. After a five minutes' count of money and pledge cards it was announced that the amount had been subscribed. Probably this appeal from a Methodist newspaper will be equally successful: "Is there any reader, a lover of souls, anxious for the extension of the Kingdom of Christ, that will give £4,000 for the purchase of a mission hall, now available in a town within thirty miles of London, where there is an almost neglected area with a population of 8,000 to 10,000, mostly working classes?" The advertisement is a little spoiled in the sequel by the suggestion of easier terms. Thus far it is a good advertisement, showing a firm belief that there are people who have money at liberty, and a good hope that some one of them will be generous. May this faith and hope find their partner—charity.

THE March number of the Rev. Henry Gow's *Rosslyn Hill Sermons* is on "A Free Catholic Church," with the text from Romans viii. 14, 15, beginning, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God." A saying of Dr. Hunter's is quoted:—

"I desire a Church for disciples of Jesus Christ of all shades of opinion, who seek for unity without asking for uniformity; a Church for the devotional and the ethical, for the meditative and the practical, for the man of much faith and the man of little faith; a Church which stands for true Catholicism, without Roman or Evangelical or other limitations; a Church simply Christian and nothing more."

To which Mr. Gow adds: "I would rather express it, 'A Church simply Christian and nothing less.'"

The sermon concludes as follows:—

"The truer and more spiritual our thought of God becomes, the closer are we drawn in bonds of affection, not with a sect or a party, but with all men and women who seek to do the best they

know. He who really loves God and really desires to follow Christ is quick to see and sympathise with the religious feeling expressed in forms of faith differing from his own. Looking round at the various opinions held by sincere and earnest men he will say with St. Paul, 'There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices, and none of them are without significance.' He will hold firmly to the opinion which seems to him most true, but he will look below opinions to the inner life. 'What the Church needs to-day,' it has been well said, 'is not defenders of the faith, however eloquent or wise, but the actual spectacle of Christian lives which are wholly distinct from the lives of worldly men—lives content and meek and laborious—lives consistently devoted to the service of mankind.' And, it may be added, what the world needs to-day is the spectacle of a Church whose worshippers are free men and women, not bound together by a name or by a creed, but united in a fellowship which is open to all who desire to love God, to follow Christ and to work righteousness. The basis of such a Church will be that expressed in the words of my text: 'They that are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God,' and its deepest desire will be that expressed in the well-known hymn by Charles Wesley:—

'Sweetly may we all agree
Touched with softest sympathy:
There is neither bond nor free,
Great nor servile Lord in Thee;
Love like Death hath all destroyed,
Rendered all distinctions void!
Names and sects and parties fall;
Thou, O Lord, art all in all.'

THE Rev. W. G. Tarrant's March sermonette (to be had at Wandsworth for a penny) is on "The First Mild Day." It is a good word for all dwellers in the big city, recalling Wordsworth's Sonnet on Westminster bridge, and the lines to his sister on "the first mild day of March." To the breathless haste of the Londoner, who cannot afford to stop and listen to what Nature may have to say, Mr. Tarrant replies:—"Now, if you talk of affording, can we really afford not to lift our eyes occasionally, and open our minds to such glimpses of beauty as may come to us even in the 'populous city pent'? It is unnecessary for me to say, 'Ask the doctor whether all this rush and perpetual grind is good for you'; simply ask yourself: Is this what you call living? Is it rational, is it truly profitable? Why be deaf and blind before your time? Why give up the natural and wholesome appetite for the beautiful, which waits for you as much as for poets and artists? Why condemn yourself to pay your hard-earned money for 'pleasures' that leave you with a headache; when, all the while there are better pleasures that you can have simply for the price of looking round you? Then comes a word as to what we may see in town, if only we have eyes. This is the real "Pageant" of London, which has already begun. These few pages are in pleasant form, convenient to enclose in letters to friends.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The Editor is not responsible for the opinions expressed by correspondents. LETTERS CANNOT BE INSERTED WITHOUT THE WRITER'S NAME, and all private information should be accompanied by the name and address of the senders.]

HEGELIANISM AND COMMON SENSE.

SIR,—I rejoice to meet such honest and healthy-minded dissent as that which H. G. has written in regard to my two articles in the *Hibbert*. This is the kind of criticism from which there is something to be learnt.

It is clear that Hegelianism is still suspect as "a dodge" having for its chief object to prove that plain men are fools. It is disliked as the supposed creed of superior persons. And behind all this there lies a yet stronger aversion, due to the idea that Hegelianism, not content with proving man to be a fool, proves God to be something worse, viz., the deliberate author of human sin.

I think the term Hegelianism is not very happily chosen by H. G. It is almost a term of reproach, made so by people who know Hegel only at secondhand, backed by a multitude who do not know him at all. Not that I am unwilling to confess my debts to him. Whatever I am that is not foolish I owe to my teachers; and though I am wholly unable to apportion the share due to each, Hegel is certainly one of them, and so H. G. may call me Hegelian if he likes. But I could tell him of half-a-dozen other names that would do as well. I would remind him, also, that many people are called Hegelian nowadays whom it would be hardly less correct to describe as cannibals. And, further, that some of Hegel's bitterest critics at the present moment differ from Hegel only in being more Hegelian than he was himself.

I do not think that the difference between Hegelianism and common sense is of that ultimate nature which H. G. represents it to be. Both common sense and Hegelianism rest upon contradictions. They differ in this: Hegelianism admits the contradiction, accepts it, welcomes it, and uses the consciousness of it as the positive basis of constructive thought. Common sense seeks to hide the contradiction; it does so by first standing with one of the contradictions, then standing with the other, then forgetting that a moment ago it stood with the first, and finally using the last of these operations as an argument for proving that no contradiction exists. In short, Hegelianism differs from common sense only as an ostrich with its head in the air, resolutely facing its pursuers, differs from the same ostrich with its head in the sand. The latter is no doubt the more comfortable attitude—for a time.

It is quite a mistake to suppose that Hegelianism is a creed for comfortable moles. It is the most serious of all the philosophies, and is in earnest to a degree which is almost repellent. Its affinities are with Tragedy in Art and with the Cross in religion. It thrusts its hand into the flame; it deliberately goes up to Jerusalem. H. G. finds it clothed in "silk and satin"; but perhaps he has not noticed that it has a shirt of hair next the skin. Hegelianism often talks sternly to common sense. Contradictions are dangerous things to play with; and common sense, as it

changes from side to side, running first with the hare, then with the hounds, then trying to run with both, and finally running with neither, seems to Hegelianism to be doing a very dangerous thing.

H. G.'s remarks make it pretty plain that common sense has its own burden to bear. Heavy as the Hegelian burden is I would not exchange mine for his. I said nothing in the *Hibbert* articles about the problem of evil; but H. G. supplies the omission by making me say something to which I should be very sorry to set my signature. And in making me say it he adds something of his own, which I am glad is his and not mine. "The responsibility for the tiger and the cancer microbe, and for all such wild destructive forces, animate and inanimate, rests entirely with God." And I would point out that the difficulty of ascribing these things to God is not in the least mitigated by calling them, as H. G. does, "natural" forces. Does he mean by this that the cancer microbe is to God what it is to us, viz., a fact found in existence and accepted? He cannot mean that. The tiger and the microbe are things that God does, and not things that He finds as we find them. They are as truly His acts as the betrayal of Jesus was the act of Judas. Now I cannot, for the life of me, understand that attitude of mind, apparently H. G.'s, which finds it religiously offensive to suppose that God has any part in the act of Judas, but religiously inoffensive to make him wholly responsible for those acts which are represented to us by the tiger and the cancer microbe. To cover this up by calling the microbe "natural" is precisely to put one's head in the sand; as done by God it is as truly moral as any act that is done by me. H. G. mustn't say that moral categories cannot be applied to the activity of God; for it is by the application of such categories that he rules out a supposed argument of mine about Judas. Here, it seems to me, common sense displays a contradiction which will require a good deal of Hegelian assistance to overcome. On the other hand, you refuse to allow that God is in any degree implicated in the act of Judas, because that would make Him a partner in wrong; on the other hand, you make Him "wholly responsible" for, i.e., directly willing and performing, all that in human life and experience of which the tiger and the cancer microbe are the symbols. If that is not a contradiction I do not know the meaning of the term.

It is, of course, an old device of thought to save the character of God by drawing a sharp distinction between natural and moral evil, attributing the former to the inscrutable wisdom of God, the latter to the perversity or corruption of man. The difficulty about this is, as I have just pointed out, that what are "natural" evils as witnessed by us become moral evils when we regard them as done by God. But there is another difficulty. It is perfectly logical to conserve your faith in God by discharging Him of all responsibility for wrong-doing, and laying the burden of this exclusively on the shoulders of man. But what, then, becomes of your faith in man, which, according to the jingle recently quoted in this paper, is an essential element of our belief. Man, regarded as the author of all

wickedness, is no more an object for faith than God would be under the same conditions. Is it not just as hard "to believe in man," when you have made him responsible for the sum of wickedness, as it would be to believe in a God who shared that responsibility? For my part I should find it hard to "believe in" a race one member of which had ever done a single evil act merely because it was evil. I should accept one evil act done for evil's sake as sufficient proof of something intrinsically bad in humanity, and my "faith in man" would disappear. Unless you are prepared for some such conclusion you make no gain by saving the character of God at the expense of man. Such attempts, of course, have been made again and again, and in every case the result has been the same. If you would vindicate the holiness of God in this way you cannot escape having to pay the price in the shape of a doctrine of depravity in man. Even Kant could not escape it. Thus expounded, faith in God and faith in man are contradictions. The argument which establishes the one destroys the other. It would be hard to find a better example of the see-saw proceedings of common sense. The history of that see-saw would fill a volume.

I pass to another point. H. G. quotes my statement, "that the deletion of any one member from the organism of the world's thinking would threaten the life of the whole," and he takes me to task for this, because, in his view, it means "that all actions, even the basest and most wicked, are organic, and that the world would be the poorer without them." He gives the instance of Judas Iscariot, and insists, in effect, that religion cannot regard his conduct as organic to the life of the whole, or as a matter in which God can be supposed to have any part or implication.

I suppose that H. G. regards human history as in some sense an organic whole. He would scarcely object to my saying that through the ages "one increasing purpose runs." That is only another way of saying that the great web of human experience is the expression of a consistent plan—i.e., organic.

But what place in this great world plan is to be assigned to all the base and wicked acts done since the beginning? Have they no place in it? Are all base and wicked acts entirely outside the world plan, through which runs the increasing purpose of God? Does this latter admit into its constitution only those acts of man that are not base nor wicked? If so, it must be confessed that vast sections of human history are not covered by the Divine Purpose at all. Even Common Sense will pause before accepting that. If, on the other hand, these base and wicked acts do somehow form part of the web that is being woven, is it so monstrous a thing to hold that they are organic, and that their deletion from the general scheme would threaten the whole design?

Take the case of Judas Iscariot, introduced by H. G. Does my critic agree with me that the origin and history of Christianity represents the clearest instance known to man of the purpose and working of God? Does he agree that Christian history is essentially organic, i.e.,

the working out of an intelligent Plan or Thought? I presume that he so agrees. And what I would now ask him is whether in his view, the part played by Judas Iscariot is, or is not organic to that plan. Would not the deletion of the part played by Judas seriously threaten the life of the whole? If there had been no Judas, the whole course of the world's history would have been different. Had the master not been betrayed all that has followed from his betrayal would not have followed. Perhaps there would have been no Christian Church at all. Certainly, the deletion from the system of that one element represented by the act of Judas would have deranged the constitution of the total plan. Here, then, is another contradiction. H. G., I am assuming, would gladly make God responsible for the whole system of world-education which we call Christian history. But when some element in the system, essential to its constitution, happens to offend the moral sense, H. G. will not allow that God has anything to do with that. This seems to me an instance of that false abstraction which, though commonly charged against philosophy, is really the standing vice of common sense. You fix upon God responsibility for the whole plan, and reserve the right to make whom you will responsible for the particular acts by which the plan is fulfilled. This is to treat the plan as though it had an existence apart from the doings of the particular Judases or Johns which are the carrying-out of the plan. That is the vice of abstraction, which always ends by leaving an insoluble contradiction in the hands of those who practise it. For my part, I could not join in hymns of thanksgiving for the gift of Christianity and in the next breath damn Judas for having played a part which I see to have been necessary for the coming of the gift. Nor could I worship a God who expected such inconsistency on my part; still less could I worship him if he practised it himself.

Common sense then, as expounded by H. G., appears to me like the man who ran away from a lion and a bear met him. Its fate is that the lion and the bear divide the carcass between them. "Hegelianism" simply appeals to common sense to face the lion as the best way out of the difficulty. It does not deny that the lion means mischief; but it regards man as a being who, by his essential nature, is fitted for coping with lions. Man himself, to Hegelianism as to St. Paul, is a living contradiction; *but being aware of himself as such, he is much more*. In himself he carries the secret by which all contradictions are reconciled, and the victory won which overcometh the world. Hegelianism may be allowed an occasional sigh over the hardness of its fate. It has been held up to ridicule as the apotheosis of all abstractions; whereas from first to last its aim has been to deliver the mind from the deadly view of abstract thought. Hegelianism is an attempt to put the arms of thought round the concrete wholeness of things. It refuses to tear things out of their context. Now this latter is what H. G. does, when he picks out the act of Judas and cries "this is the thing for which Judas is solely responsible," as though Judas, or his act, were anything but

empty abstractions apart from the whole to which they belong. This is what he makes me do, when he supposes me to mean that God and not Judas sold the Master for 30 pieces of silver. Hegelianism finds no meaning in these torn-out fragments of thought, in those isolated scraps of experience, and refuses to consider them until they have been restored to their proper place in the scheme of things. Thus restored, their character is changed; Judas is no longer what he was, and even the microbe and the tiger "suffer a sea-change, into something rich and strange." A patch of red, torn from the centre of one of Turner's skies, would be an ugly and meaningless object; while the value of the whole composition, in consequence of that deletion, would be "seriously threatened." Such a patch of red is the Judas of H. G.'s argument; such a dislocated and ruined composition is the scheme from which Judas has been thus violently removed. To cut the canvas of the universe into inch squares, to say that God painted all the pretty bits, and man all those which show the colour of blood, or that God made the light, and man the shadows, this is the work of "common sense," against which Hegelianism has been a protest from the first.

To some people such a line of thought will seem vague nonsense. But not to H. G. I am very sure that he himself has used this language many a time. That he lacks not the courage on which all high views are based is sufficiently shown by what he says about the tiger. Were he at this moment sent to console the widow whose only son the tiger had slain, he would leave his "common sense" behind him, and either talk "Hegelianism" or hold his peace.

L. P. JACKS.

SIR,—I do not wish to interfere in any duel between two such champions as Mr. Jacks and his critic H. G. I am a plain, common-sense man, and cannot help feeling that the attempt to grasp the nature of ultimate existence and to explain the meaning of the universe is a task too great for me. It is a task which brings the child and the philosopher to the same level, which makes the labour of a thousand years spent in philosophic speculation seem futile. It necessarily leads even common-sense people to speak in paradox—to say that God "*intended the tiger*," that God did not intend "Judas Iscariot just as he was," that "the responsibility for the tiger and the cancer microbe rests entirely with God"—making the Infinite even as one of us. But this is not my object in writing. If we cannot ascertain the ultimate nature of things, we can at least ascertain the nature of some things. H. G. is, I think, a little unfair to the tiger, in spite of the fact that "God intended the tiger." The tiger is an "apparently useless force in nature." If so what a lot of trouble nature has taken in vain! Look at the powerful muscles, the jaws, the teeth, the claws, the striped hide, the tongue, the digestive organs. What a fool nature is! But is the tiger useless? Its function seems to be to keep down a too-redundant population. And in what sense is the lamb "*gentle and useful*." What is the use of a lamb? What other

than to be eaten? And who eats the lamb? Not the tiger. Perhaps H. G. knows. Will he not tell us?

O. A. SHRUBSOLE.

ON A CRITICISM BY PROFESSOR UPTON.

SIR,—In your last issue Mr. Upton has selected certain remarks of mine from the January number of *Mind*, and has criticised them. His criticism seems to me to be so extremely unfair that it is impossible to reply to it. All that I can do is to repudiate, as emphatically as possible, all the opinions which he attributes to me—in particular, to repudiate the opinion that there is no "open alternative" in cases of moral choice or in human conduct generally—and to ask the Editor kindly to allow space for quotation of the incriminated passages, in order that any readers who happen to be interested in the matter may have an opportunity of judging for themselves.

The passages selected for denunciation were, first, a quotation from Professor Pringle-Pattison's book "*The Philosophical Radicals*," and secondly, a paragraph in my own words referring to another statement by the same writer. The first passage dealt with the meaning of moral freedom. The second passage was not concerned with the meaning of freedom at all, but with a certain metaphysical theory about the relation of the real "self" to the "character"—a theory which Martin-eau seems to have held.

The passage quoted directly from Professor Pringle-Pattison was as follows:—"The fact that the moral law can present itself to a man is sufficient proof that he possesses the capacity to realise its demands; it could not otherwise be a motive to him at all. As an ethical being, there reside in him all the capacities of his race. What he ought to be, that he might be, and he judges his act accordingly, both while it is in process of contemplation and when he looks back, it may be remorse-fully, upon his choice. All things are possible to him—not as a finite individual at any given moment of time (the ethical consciousness guarantees no miracles), but eternally possible to every son of man. The absolute claim of the moral ideal, and its infinitely regenerative power in breaking the yoke of the past, seem to me the real facts to which the moral consciousness testifies." With regard to this passage, my crime is that I spoke of it as "exceedingly valuable and suggestive," and added that "to affirm moral freedom is to say that *ought* implies *can*."

The other passage was as follows. After quoting an earlier statement of Professor Pringle-Pattison, to the effect that "the point to be grasped in the free-will controversy is that a man and his motives are one, and that consequently he is in every instance self-determined," I continued thus:—

"This statement, which is one of the commonplaces of a certain school of ethical writers, has always seemed to me only to bury the ethical question under a heap of psychological and metaphysical difficulties; for it involves two of the most ambiguous terms in the whole range of philosophical discussion—'self' and 'motive.' To give

the statement any definite meaning involves a whole psychology of volition and a metaphysical theory of the self. Martineau's view is really an attempt to justify certain *ethical facts* by a metaphysical theory that the will is an absolute cause, absolute, but acting through the phenomenal contents of mind. The phenomenal motor ideas, &c., are essentially related to the Will (which on this theory is the same as the Self); but the Self, as Will, is capable of absolute causal action, and therefore of absolute responsibility. Hence follows the use made of the common-sense distinction between the 'character' and the 'Self' which *has* the character—a distinction which is made sharp enough for the moral act as such (the *choice*) to be wholly attributed to the Self, considered apart from the character, while the latter accounts only for the presentation of the phenomenal motor ideas as possible alternatives of action. We must agree with Professor Pringle-Pattison that any such theory must be finally rejected, on the ground that agency cannot be predicated of a characterless Self, and if the Self, *qua* agent, is *not* the character, the relation between them, implied in saying that the Self *has* the character, is broken down. Martineau was certainly wrong in supposing that the problem of the Self's relation to its character and motives—i.e., the problem of Substance and Attribute—is solved by the mere use of the word 'has'; on the other hand, to say that 'the Self and its motives are one' seems not only useless but definitely misleading."

The reader will see that *two* opinions are here criticised and rejected. One is the opinion which Martineau appears to have held; the other is the opinion of "a certain school of ethical writers." *These are the Hegelians* with whom Mr. Upton is determined to class me (and everyone else who diverges in the slightest degree from the beaten track of his own formulæ). Possibly Mr. Upton would declare that belief in moral freedom stands or falls with this metaphysical theory of the "self" which seems to him of such vital importance. I regret to say that to me it seems unimportant, and mistaken; and belief in moral freedom can be held perfectly well without it.

Mr. Upton's numerous references to Professor James are very misleading. Readers are left to suppose that James is a devout exponent of "the metaphysical self." Anyone who thinks so, ought to consult the "Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research," for May, 1901, pages 13 to 23. Here and in a hundred other places, James has shown that human personality is an infinitely complex thing,—far too complex to fit into a cut-and-dry distinction between a so-called "metaphysical self" and its "phenomena." True, James believes in moral freedom; but he believes in it because the belief *works*, and the fact that it works is a fact of experience.

I cannot help the uneasy suspicion that Mr. Upton is living in the controversies and distinctions of twenty-five years ago, which are now rapidly losing whatever life and meaning they had. I owe so much to Mr. Upton's teaching that it is very painful to me to write in this strain. But under such extraordinary misrepresentations (and

such I cannot but call them) it is impossible to be silent. I do not intend, however, to enter into any further controversy in this matter.

S. H. MELLONE.

Hollywood, County Down, Feb. 22.

NEW THEOLOGY AND FREE WILL.

SIR,—With reference to the subject of the Immanence of God as it affects our free will, I should be very grateful if Professor Upton would criticise the following position:—

It is not at the moment of the individual action wherein our freedom exists, but at a previous date. For my own part I never felt free to act as I would in the moment of temptation. While deploring the act, I always felt that I was irresistibly held back by some physical or mental weakness. At the same time I never lost the feeling that in some way I was free to produce the condition from which the action sprang. Unitarianism gave me no help, but in New Thought and modern Psychology I recognised at once a solution.

I learn from the New Theology that we have to develop our consciousness of the higher life so that we may be irresistibly drawn towards those higher conditions from which the right actions mechanically spring. To cherish perpetually the higher thought, to gradually increase our consciousness of the Divine, is to create within ourselves a Force which will expend itself involuntarily in the right direction at the moment of trial.

Psychology corroborates this process. The first condition of mind is the Attention. After the attention has been fixed for a time there grows the habit of fixing the attention in a given direction. From this habit there develops a thought and desire in the same direction. The muscular movement or action is the automatic result of the thought current.

I may not be expounding New Thought in the terms of its usual exponents, but I take its teaching as giving me the following instructions:—God is immanent in us; not only as a Spirit within our spirit, or as the Creator of our bodies, but He is the vital part of every physical and mental particle we possess. By bringing our minds into consciousness of this divine essence within us we take the first step in forming true channels of thought. When these channels are dug deeply enough we act right automatically; but we had the option originally of not entering into consciousness with the true force. The history of religion has surely been an attempt to put this psychological law of our being into expression. The psychologist says, give your attention to high things; the theologian says "Dwell in God."—Fix your mind on true things.—"Whatsoever is true . . . think on these things."—The subconscious force will permeate your whole physical being for good—"They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength . . . they shall run and not faint." We are irresistibly drawn to the given result till channels are formed to perpetuate it. "God keeps us from all harm; the snares of the evil one cannot come nigh us." And lastly, the action follows of itself. The action being a natural result of the close communion with the highest, there is

lost that self-conscious egotistic pride in a virtuous act, for "Not I . . . but the Father worketh in me."

We may in a sense, then, repent of an act, even though we felt utterly powerless at the moment. And this because (by neglect of our mind development) we had allowed ourselves to fall into the condition that could produce such an act.

For the more practical minded we may regard the matter in the same light as the last move in a game of chess. The checkmate is the deliberate voluntary choice, but it is only of effect because of the array of forces brought up during the game and is entirely dependent upon the surrounding conditions for its checkmate.

To other temperaments there comes a great sense of relief in being no longer goaded to concentrate the attention on the momentary act. The strain is relaxed, and the soul seeks to fill itself with the strength which will meet its need in future trials.

ANNIE J. LAWRENCE.

SELF-DETERMINATION.

SIR,—Professor Upton challenges us to assent, first, to the proposition that the Hegelian conception of the will is determinism masquerading as freedom; and, secondly, to the view that Dr. Martineau's indeterminism is the truth which alone will preserve for us the deep realities of religion. May I say why I dispute both positions?

The attempt to separate "character" and "will" seems to me not to correspond with fact. Character is our habitual temper of willing. Our self-utterance in deeds is the manifestation of what we are. Beside, if the self is suspended in some marvellous way in vacuo over the character there seems to be no reason why it should descend upon one alternative offered rather than another. Or, if you say that it is the real self, the self in its divine perfection, then it looks to me as though you have a new form of determinism which will always, by its very nature, choose the right alternative. But it does not. Why? It is not the self in its full reality, is the imperfect self, which is so far as defined our present character.

The Hegelian view, as I understand it, is not determinist. Professor Upton seems to hold that for this philosophy the self is a particular among particulars, a link, or many links in the chain of cause and effect. For though its actions are its choice, its choice is inevitable from the past. To me that is an entire misapprehension. The self is universal; consequently a man is as much his future as his past. His past volitions have been efforts to realise an imperfectly realised self, the result of himself calling to himself. And to-day himself is still calling to himself. We present ends to ourselves to achieve, which are not the mere outcome of the past, but are conceptions of the ways in which a self-conscious spirit is able to further realise itself, to make explicit what is implicit. Indeed, the past may be so apprehended as to be condemned, and the relation to it be negative. By virtue of its universality the self may withdraw itself from the forms in which it has hitherto expressed itself, and, although remaining itself, that self

which is its past, reconstruct its world after the new conception and transmute the disowned manifestations into the material of a more adequate self-realisation. And it can do this because it is more than its past, because it is not a mere particular but is a universal, and implicitly infinite.

The self which can so act can, by virtue of the same universality act otherwise. For example, a man who has on the whole willed the laws in which the ethical system expresses itself may, under an idea of some good, set himself against that system in the particular. Or, under the influence of the idea of some advantage may act in disharmony with an honourable past. This setting up by the individual of an end for himself which is not a social end, is caprice. Professor Upton would apparently call it freedom.

To me the essence of freedom lies, then, in the universality of the will, and its actuality in the concrete willing of the ethical system, which is in process of temporal explication. The theory of self-determination is related to Determinism in that it requires a definite content, and knows nothing of the will except as continuously self-manifesting spirit. It is related to indeterminism in that the volitions of the self are the volitions of the universal which, though present in is not exhausted by nor identical with its manifestations. Determinism and Indeterminism are abstractions of which self-determination is the truth.

A. A. CHARLESWORTH.

LICENSING LEGISLATION.

SIR,—I observe that Mr. Robt. J. Gregg, in his letter of February 23, desires not to argue, "but to enlighten." This is a kindly thought, and we put our minds into a proper state of receptiveness. What must be our astonishment, then, at being offered the following statements: (1) That vested interests in licensed properties have "existed from time immemorial"; and (2) that "the Court of Probate has always recognised vested interest in licensed houses, taking care to treat licences not as annual, but as running concurrently with the lease, and thereby increasing value of same for purposes of estate duty."

As to the first, there has been no shadow of doubt, at all events since the judgment of the House of Lords in *Sharp v. Wakefield*, that a licensee of any inn, alehouse, or victualling-house, had, apart from the Licensing Act of 1904 (and from certain off-licences under the Act of 1869), no more legal right to a renewal of his licence than he had to obtain one in the first instance. The discretion of the justices is the same in both cases.

As to the second statement, it is to be observed that the Court of Probate has nothing to do with the valuation of property, whether licensed or not, for the purpose of estate duty. This rests with the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, and the basis of value is merely the price which it is estimated the property would fetch in the market. That price is, of course, dependent on what the purchaser thinks is the chance, or probability, of the renewal of the licence, but in no case is the licensee regarded as having a

vested interest in his licence, apart from the Act of 1904. The position could hardly, indeed, be better summed up than in Mr. Montgomery's able letter in your last issue.

Mr. Gregg concludes by a reference to a publican who, ten years ago, paid to his landlord £8,000 for renewal of his lease for 50 years, and asks whether it will be honest for the State to acquire that man's business at the expiration of 15 years without proper compensation. The reply to this is that when that publican obtained his licence the State conferred on him, practically for nothing, a valuable monopoly, and only promised it to him for a year. When he obtained its renewal that renewal was for a year. If he expended money in the confidence that the magistrates would exercise their discretion in the same way throughout his lease, *without taking steps* (out of his profits) *to insure himself against the event of their not doing so*, he has, after all, only himself to thank.

H. J. R. HERFORD.

London, March 3, 1908.

ARTICLES IN THE REVIEWS.

THE *Contemporary* this month has an article by M. Paul Sabatier on "Modernism," which, a note informs us, is not exactly a résumé of his Jowett Lectures now in course of delivery at the Passmore Edwards Settlement, but consists of "the passages in which dominating ideas took form." The most striking article in this number is "My Profession of Faith," by Father Petroff, an unfrocked priest of the Russian Church. It is a tremendous indictment of that Church by one who yet believes "that Christ's truth will overmaster everything, and that both the Russian Church and the Russian nation will become free and establish in their fatherland the kingdom of God." Other Churches besides the Russian should give heed to this appeal. "The essence of the Church," says Father Petroff, "is Christ, the application to life of the truth of the Gospel. To be the herald of this truth, to take at least some part, as the servant of the Church, in building up the kingdom of God among men, I looked upon, and still do look upon, as a most sublime and joy-giving work, a work which even in our days needs ever more and more workmen. For among us, even after nineteen centuries of Gospel preaching, there have been and are at most individual Christians, exceptional persons; but there is no Christianity, no Christian legislation. There are no Christian ethical standards of living. There is no Christian form of government. There is neither a Christian society nor a Christian state. Of the Christianity of the whole human race it would be strange even to speak. The relations of nations one to another are shaped by a spirit that runs diametrically counter to the spirit of the Gospel. The most Christian States maintain armies numbering millions for the mass murder now of neighbours belonging to other races; now of those of their own citizens who are discontented with the methods of violence in vogue. The last resources of the deluded population are being drained for monstrous human shambles, for

weapons of destruction. Massacre is raised to the level of a science—the science of slaying. Wherein do these reciprocal relations of Christian peoples differ from the international dealings of old pagan antiquity? And wherein are the dealings adopted by states towards the citizens different from those of heathendom?" Father Petroff writes from bitter experience in his own country. He was a member of the second Duma. In the Literary Supplement we are very glad to see a brief notice of the second (abridged) edition of "A Spiritual Faith," by John Hamilton Thon, of whom it is said: "He worked in close touch with Dr. Martineau and made a deep impression on religious life in that centre of earnest Unitarianism, Liverpool. He died in 1894, but the vigour of his sermons has survived him. They may be read to-day with spiritual benefit and with pleasure, for the reader at once realises a literary gift of no mean order as well as an intense sense of reality. Many striking phrases occur page after page. 'Laws are not powers,' he writes in the sermon entitled 'Prayer the Communion of the Holy Spirit,' 'but only modes of the action of God.' The thought is wonderfully fruitful."

The *Nineteenth Century and After* opens with some lines on "The Gods of Greece," by the late Sir James Knowles, the editor and founder of the Review. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald makes reply on the subject of "The Impotence of Socialism," and the Vicar of St. Clement's, Fulham, pours out his soul, the troubled soul of a parochial clergyman, as to Women's Settlements, and the disturbance they introduce into a well-ordered parish. The article would be absurd if it referred to any but a strictly sectarian and Anglican settlement. Miss Rose M. Bradley contributes a vivid picture of "Matty of Spitalfields." Mrs. William Tyrrel's article on "Fear in the Home and the Household" should be also noted.

The *Albany Review* with this number completes a second volume, and its first year as successor to the *Independent Review*. It contains two painful and arresting pictures of evil conditions in very different quarters of the world, the one an account of the personal experience of F. S. Sussex of "Life at a Factory," the other Ralph Durrand's story of the Congo, "Where Blood with Gold is Bought and Sold." Fiction that may be, but fiction true to the facts of the present infamous administration of the Congo territory. Those who want to know the meaning of "Sinn Fein" should read the Rev. J. O. Hannay's article on that remarkable movement. In a lighter vein is the Hon. Gilbert Coleridge's article on "Wild Life in Kensington Gardens." Mr. F. C. S. Schiller, writing on "The Tribulations of Truth," makes a vigorous stand for Pragmatism, and gets some comment out of the fight.

In this month's *Cornhill* there is a delightful article by Miss Catherine I. Dodd on "Jena Past and Present," and Mr. A. C. Benson "At Large" writes on "Optimism." "The one question for the would-be optimist is whether humanity is growing nobler, wiser, more unselfish; and of that I have no doubt whatever. The sense of equality, of the rights of the weak, com-

passion, brotherliness, benevolence are living ideas, throbbing with life; the growth of democracy, much as it may tend to inconvenience one personally, is an entirely hopeful and desirable thing; and if a man is disposed to pessimism he ought to ask himself seriously to what extent his pessimism is conditioned by his own individual prospect of happiness. . . . Nothing in the world could be so indicative of the rise in the moral and emotional temperature of the world as the fact that men are increasingly disposed to sacrifice their own ambitions and their own comfort for the sake of others, and are willing to suffer, if the happiness of the race may be increased; and much of the pessimism that prevails is the pessimism of egotists and individualists, who feel no interest in the rising tide because it does not promise to themselves any increase in personal satisfaction."

OBITUARY.

MRS. SHEPHERD.

THIS respected woman, the oldest member on the roll of the Aberdeen Unitarian congregation, passed away on February 24. By her birth even she was connected with the church, for her father, Robert Robertson ("Radical Robertson" he was called) was an active member of it. She had a constitution fitted for liberty of thought and progressive action, and her whole life was lived in accordance with its upper lead. Her talents and favourable circumstances led her into association with persons of culture and refinement, mainly in American Unitarian circles, and she readily assimilated the loftiness and integrity she found among them. She (and a sister, Mrs. Dickson, still living) went young into service in the family of the Rev. Brooke Herford, and her life got its set there. She was a faithful servant and a devoted companion, and all the homes in which she lived were enriched by her presence. She returned to her native city about twelve years ago. Her attachment to her Unitarian faith was vital. Her soul was in her church. Never was there a more eager hearer of the preacher's word, or a more earnest worshipper of the Eternal Goodness.

A. W.

M. PAUL SABATIER gave the second of his lectures on "Modernism" at the Passmore Edwards Settlement on Tuesday afternoon, and there was again a large attendance. A good report of the lecture appeared in Thursday's *Times*. It dealt chiefly with the leading men of the movement, of whom in this country Father Tyrrell is the chief, and in Italy, the Abbé Murri, who is specially obnoxious to the Pope on account of his social heresies, added to the religious. In the Middle Ages, M. Sabatier said in conclusion, the Church had saved science; in the 20th century it would be science that would save the Church.

On the three Sunday evenings, March 15, 22 and 29, the Rev. J. Page Hopps is to speak at Little Portland Street Chapel on "A Scientific Basis of Belief in a Future Life." The service is at seven.

THE CHILDREN'S COLUMN.

THE AMERICAN ABOLITIONISTS.

Do you know what a martyr is? You have read of Stephen, the first Christian martyr. He, you know, was put to death for being a follower of Christ; put to death because he chose to obey God rather than man, and to do what he felt to be right, and speak what he felt to be true, whatever men might say or do to him. A *martyr*, in Greek, originally meant a witness; and it has come to mean one who bears witness to some great truth, so earnestly that he is willing to suffer for it, and even to die for it, feeling it to be more precious than all that he has, or even than life itself.

When Christianity was a new religion, and the Christians were in the midst of idolaters, who wanted them to give up their faith in Christ, and worship idols, many of them chose to be put to death with cruel tortures rather than do this. And some of you have read of Ridley, and Latimer, and Cranmer, and many others, who were imprisoned and tortured, and burnt to death, because they would not obey kings and queens about the way in which to worship God, but chose to do what their own consciences told them was right.

But I dare say you have thought that was a long time ago, and there are no martyrs now. So I will tell you of some things that happened in America about seventy or eighty years ago—within the memory of old people who are still living.

Some of you have heard of the Pilgrim Fathers, who left England in the reign of Charles I. to avoid persecution, and settled in a part of America which they called New England. Other parts were colonised by other settlers from England, at different times. The country where they settled is a very large one—many times larger than England; and in some parts of it the climate is hot, so as to make it very difficult for white men to work hard there. (That is where most of our cotton comes from; and sugar, coffee, rice, and tobacco are grown there too; and some of these require very hard labour to cultivate them.) So when the white men found the climate too hot, and the work too hard for them, they sent to Africa for some negroes to work for them. And the traders who went to Africa to fetch these negroes did not ask them whether they would like to go, but took them prisoners, and forced them on board the ships, away from their homes, and made slaves of them.

When they reached America, they were sold to anybody who would give a high price for them; and the money was not paid to them; it all went to the cruel men who had torn them from their homes; and they were sent to work on the plantations for the rest of their lives, and paid nothing for their work but just food and clothing, and often little enough of that, and if they refused to work for their unjust masters, they were cruelly flogged and ill-treated.

Some day, perhaps, you will read, if you have not already done so, in the book called "Uncle Tom's Cabin," what terrible things the poor slaves were often made to suffer.

Now, what right had these white men to make slaves of the poor blacks and tyrannise over them in this way?

Christ teaches us that we should love our neighbour as ourselves; and the Apostle Paul says that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men," so that all are His children, and ought to be kind to one another.

People had been so long accustomed to the thought of men and women being made slaves, that they had begun to think there was no great harm in it; or perhaps they said, "Well, it's a pity, but it can't be helped, for we *must* have our sugar, our coffee, and our rice, and how could we get them without slaves?"

But at last a young man appeared, who had a great lesson to teach his countrymen. That was William Lloyd Garrison.

When a man from New England made a profit by buying a cargo of slaves, and selling them again at New Orleans, Garrison wrote a letter to a newspaper, saying what a sin and a shame it was to trade in human beings. The slave dealer was not punished; he had done nothing against the law of his country; but Garrison, for saying what a wicked thing he thought it, was prosecuted and sentenced to pay a very heavy fine; and because he could not pay it, he was put in prison. And there he might have stayed for years, but that a gentleman named Arthur Tappan, feeling that Garrison had done right, generously paid the fine for him.

Then Garrison and another man set up a newspaper, called the *Liberator*, on purpose to make known to the world what a shocking and wicked thing slavery is. They were poor men, and it took all the money they had to set up a printing press, and keep it at work; and for some time they had to live on little more than bread and water; but they were determined to do their utmost to make known the wickedness of slavery.

This was in 1831. Two years later, a Miss Crandall, who kept a girls' school in Connecticut (a free state), gave notice that she had no objection to take coloured children. But the parents of some of the white pupils said they would take their children away if the coloured children were allowed to come! Miss Crandall said they might do as they liked about that, but she would not send away the coloured children. But the townspeople objected, and persuaded the Parliament of Connecticut to make a law forbidding anyone to open a school for coloured children! Think of making a law to forbid children being taught!

Well, Miss Crandall said she would not mind this law, for they had no right to make it—it was against the Constitution. She was prosecuted again and again; for the first time the jury could not agree; her neighbours did not wait for a jury to convict her, but persecuted her in every way—pulling down her fences, filling up her well, tradespeople refusing to supply her, threatening her pupils on their way to school, till their parents were afraid to send them. So at last she had to give up her school, and leave the town. But she was a brave woman to persevere so long.

M. C. MARTINEAU.

(To be continued.)

The Inquirer.

ESTABLISHED 1842.

To all parts of the World:—

	s.	d.
PER QUARTER	1	8
PER HALF-YEAR	3	4
PER YEAR	6	6

One Shilling per year extra will be charged if credit is taken.

Advertisements should reach the office not later than Twelve o'clock on THURSDAY to appear the same week.

All payments in respect to THE INQUIRER to be made to E. KENNEDY, 3, Essex Street, Strand, London, W.C.

LONDON, MARCH 7, 1908.

A TRUE MISSION.

THE Provincial meetings of our two Associations in Liverpool, fully reported in last week's INQUIRER, have left pleasant memories, and a sense of encouragement not only from the gathering of friends from far and near, but from more than one strong and helpful utterance. If we recall these now, it is that we may rejoice in the conviction that here our brethren have a hold upon the truth, and help to make clearer to us all the great end for which we are united in the fellowship of our free churches.

It is for religion, and not for the pursuit of any denominational or sectarian end. The growth of our fellowship we rightly desire, and must be doing whatever seems most wise and helpful towards extending our borders and strengthening the effectiveness of our organisation; but that must always come as a secondary thing, as means towards the greater end; and the impulse of growth, the power which commands success, will really come unconsciously, and the more fully, the less we think about it or strive after that particular thing, and forget ourselves altogether in the eagerness of our purpose to minister to religious needs and give ourselves up completely to the spirit of worship and unselfish service.

It is simply religion that is the great end. Not argument about religion or discourse about its virtues, least of all, controversy with others who have a different theory from ours, but religion itself, the life with God—the adoration, the rejoicing worship, the confession, the supplication; the passion of its hunger after righteousness, the vision of its purity, the pouring forth of love in helpful service, the ministering to all human needs, the deep sense of communion with the Unseen, and the cleansing and ennobling of the seen in that holy fellowship, making always towards the perfecting of the Kingdom even here on earth.

This was well brought out in connection with our duty to the children at the meeting of the Sunday School Association, where, in speech after speech, it was emphasised that it is just religion that is needed, in the teacher, to call out this

answering life of religion in the child; and that with this no other gift can be compared. Then in Mr. Weatherall's sermon, setting forth the high ideal of Christian chivalry, we were called once more to the passionate search for a pure and true Christianity, to be declared now in terms of life. And this again was the real burden of Mr. PEACH's address at the conference on Social Service, while he pleaded that our churches must be open now as ever to all truth, not only in the matter of doctrine, but just as much in all the earnest searching for a better way in the ordering of our common life. It is life, more perfect life, towards which we must be always striving, the life of those who are living souls, and recognise their kinship with the Eternal. Thus in ever clearer and clearer vision, it is religion which is the great end, religion purifying and uplifting the whole life.

That is the true mission to which we are called, and this again was very finely demonstrated in the address of the Rev. T. P. SPEDDING, the missionary agent of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. That address appeared, we believe, in full in last week's *Christian Life*, but we hope that it may be separately printed for still wider distribution by the Association. It should help our churches to realise more fully what the Van Mission, under Mr. SPEDDING's guidance, really means, and how it may be a very noble effort of self-forgetting service, a ministry simply of religion to the deepest needs of men.

"Unitarians," said Mr. SPEDDING, "are sometimes said not to be Christians because of their theological opinions; but there is a graver accusation against our Christianity, if it is true that we are not a missionary Church; if our churches are lecture halls rather than centres of social inspiration, of stimulus, and of spiritual kindling. It is not proselytism that has to be considered, but co-operation for the sake of the Kingdom, and for the Christian ideal."

And he went on to speak of those various kinds of service to which our people have been given, with no thought of denominational advantage, but simply for the sharing of religious truth, and its helpful spirit, with others who stood in need of it. "Perhaps, after all," he added, "these are missionary works of the noblest sort, because, so far as I understand them they are undertaken without reference to any denominational benefit which may accrue. If we should set ourselves avowedly to enlarge our own borders, and to increase our membership, the reproach that we are not a missionary Church might fall away from us. For as the world judges, the missionary Church has a keen eye to its own interest. But it may be that as noble a spirit prompts the effort which is devoid of self-seeking. . . . The cause of truth is greater than that of a sect."

Speaking of the Van Mission, he went on: "We have not been without critics, who, too readily, assumed that we went out for the purposes of controversy. I do not deny that there has been controversy, because we knew that we should have to deal with everything that came along. A van platform is not like a pulpit, where the preacher has everything his own way, and where even an unconscious platitude may be excused. And then, in Liverpool, with its memories of three matchless debaters, one is not inclined to admit that controversy ought to have no place in our meetings. Dr. Martineau and his friends never attacked. Neither do we. But he was there for defence when the need arose, and we try to be; we do not decline controversy if it is offered; we take what the day brings. But at the same time controversy was less in the bill even than proselytism. We went forth for other purposes, and the people gathered round and gave us a hearing equal to the best accorded to the speakers of any organisation on the open road. . . . I think that many of us believe in this mission work even more than when it was first projected. It is no longer merely an experiment; it has succeeded beyond our expectations; and its possibilities are not exhausted. It has touched people whom our other agencies have not reached. Our audiences have included all sorts of people, but we have felt that the greatest good was done when men and women who never darken the doors of a place of worship have joined in our services. Opposition has been encountered, of course, but it has been as nothing compared with the kindnesses which have been shown, with the disposition to give us a friendly hearing, and with the appreciation of the spirit which has dictated our work. *Religion and Life* has been our one topic, so that, however our addresses may have been framed, they have always tried to touch the actual conditions of life, and to carry hope and faith and courage to those who sorely need them. And if some one wonders if it is worth while, I ask, Is it nothing that scores of thousands have heard for the first time something of the truths by which we live; that our literature has gone into thousands of homes; that hundreds of men and women representing every shade of opinion, religious and secular, have visited our vans, and expressed their sympathy, and are in touch with us to-day; that ministers of other churches have joined with us in our work; that votes of thanks—things we never look for—have been proposed to our speakers by mayors and preachers, and prominent laymen of other denominations; that an English bishop has warned his clergy against placing any obstacles in the way of our effort; that civilities have been shown and prejudices disarmed; that people who have been taught that Unitarians were infidels have acknowledged their mistake; that when we have been asked what comfort we have for the suffering, the poor, and the sinful, our answers have been received with respect and heartily acknowledged; that men and women who knew us not before have joined with us in prayer; that men have publicly and in private resolved to lead a better life; that the sacredness of the Kingdom has been brought back again to some who had lost faith in even the few great and simple

realities of all religion? If as a Church we think that there is as much virtue in giving as in getting, then this Mission is entitled to be placed alongside those other splendid works in relation to those outside the churches which deserve to be encouraged to the utmost for the Master's sake and the love of our humanity."

THE VAN MISSION.

SIR,—The arrangements for the coming summer are now in hand, and I shall be glad to hear from ministers who are willing to help us in our work. I hope that all the ministers who travelled with the vans during the last two summers will be with us again if their engagements permit, but we can extend our work if there are more volunteers. A good number of friends have already intimated their willingness to join in the campaign, and it would be of much assistance to me if others who are disposed to assist would kindly send in their names at once. It is particularly hoped that the ministers in the London, Birmingham, and South Wales areas will do their utmost for the mission during the times the vans are in their districts.

Intimations will be sent out in due course to the ministers in the towns through which the vans will pass asking them to help us in the musical and other arrangements while we are in their midst.

I am hoping to organise a Motor Auxiliary Mission for this summer. We want a flying column. Once a week, or as it can be found convenient, three, four, or half a dozen cars would run out from London, Manchester, and Birmingham, or any other large centre, to pre-arranged meeting places. Owners of cars would carry speakers and singers, and the necessary literature, &c., and would remain on the site, the speaking taking place from the cars. These visits would sometimes be in support of the vans; at other times they would be made independently. I shall be glad to have the names of gentlemen willing to assist with their cars in this particular work as early as possible.

In the course of the next few days a circular will be issued to some two thousand Unitarians who have signed our Visitors' Books, inviting them to join the Unitarian Van League. Hundreds of other Unitarians, whose names are not in the books, have attended the meetings, and I should like to have their names so that particulars could be forwarded. If this should catch the eye of any of our friends and sympathisers, will they kindly write?

May I be allowed to add that subscriptions for the current year are now due, and that it is hoped this summer, by a large addition to our number of subscribers, to make the work entirely self-supporting.

THOS. P. SPEDDING.

Clovercroft, Buckingham-road, Heaton Chapel, near Manchester, March 2, 1908.

HEAVEN is the freed and sanctified mind, enjoying God through accordance with His attributes, multiplying its bonds and sympathies with excellent beings, putting forth noble powers, and ministering, in union with the enlightened and holy, to the happiness and virtue of the universe.—*Channing.*

OUR GREAT PROBLEM.

DISCUSSION.

SIR,—Do you think we have greatly profited by the discussion on "Our Great Problem"? I am doubting whether there really is any great problem. Is it possible that, after all, Mr. E. J. Rymer told the whole story when he said: "My personal feeling is that all our churches require is a little more individual zeal and enthusiasm of church attendance and a consciousness of the loss it would be to each if deprived of the privilege and blessing of a Unitarian church to worship in; and, may I add, a little more energy towards mission work, spreading the Gospel as they read it, and sharing with others what is so precious to themselves"? There is everywhere a depreciation of worship, meditation, and spiritual communion; and, strange to say, some of our best men and women unintentionally help that depreciation by the supreme demand for "social service." Let us have "social service," by all means. We cannot have too much of it. But that is not the first business of a congregation. The first business of a congregation is that of keeping the fountain pure, and the supply of the water of life fresh. Our much-discussed and over-discussed "weakness" is entirely the result of unconcern about the fountain, and the remedy for that is as simple and as natural as the coming down of a child to breakfast and greeting its mother with a kiss.

All the representation and organisation in the world will not add to the strength of the sleepy, the supine, and the absentee.

J. PAGE HOPPS.

SIR,—Great matters have been brought forward in your discussion, and some suggestions have been made which will bear fruit when we are free to consider them with a single mind. But the duty that lies nearest is the clearing up of the confusions which have arisen from the existence side by side of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association and the National Conference of Unitarian (and kindred) Churches. This has been already postponed too long, and some unnecessary misunderstandings have arisen.

There is, of course, no ground for any rivalry between the two organisations. Some three or four people have indeed tried to persuade us that the two have no common measure. The facts are that the community as a whole approves and honours both of them; they appeal to the same constituency; they are paid for out of the same purses, are managed pretty much by the same men; produce the same kind of oratory and conference, and finally, they both aim at the same objective, which is the increase of the love and service of God amongst us, and in the world through us. If the work of the two organisations has appeared to overlap, or to conflict, this is a mere accident of our evolution. All we need is a little time and patience to clear up the adjustment of work between the two, in accordance with their respective constitutions.

That adjustment will be governed chiefly by the fact that the elder association is a union of individual subscribers, while

the younger is composed of delegates from its constituent churches.

This difference is a very significant one, especially in connection with the fact that the Association dates from 1825 while the first Conference met in 1882. In the two generations in which the Association was solitary in the field it did a great deal in the assistance of congregations. But the experience of those years proved to the Association that a body constituted like theirs was a deficient instrument for some of the vital interests of the churches they desired to serve. Their situation in London, the eminence of their leaders, the value of their labours for civil rights, as well as the generosity and discretion with which they dealt with the grant-aided churches, all combined to give them, amongst ourselves and in the eyes of the public, a representative character and influence. But the fact was that the Association was *not* constitutionally representative, and that as a society of individuals it could not deal with certain aspects of our congregational life that urgently needed representation and discussion. Therefore, the B. and F. founded the Conference. Intended at first to be deliberative merely, the support it met with from the community at large showed that it answered to a genuine need, and was a properly constituted medium for the expression of our collective church-life. Since it was founded, the Conference has never failed to secure the sympathies of our churches *except in so far as its claims have been supposed to be hostile to the older Association*; which is widely and deservedly beloved by our churches as a whole.

Historically, it is accurate to say that the Conference was founded by the B. and F. But this, after all, is only a manner of speaking. The truth is that the instinct for fellowship among our churches, which had tried one way of expression in the older Association, sought in the Conference a fuller form. The Conference expresses the collective church consciousness of our people in a way which the B. and F. constitution did not and could not express it.

The sequel is this, that though the founders of the Conference may not have quite foreseen the significance of the new organisation, it proves to be the case that the B. and F. have now in the Conference an admirable organ for the realisation of all that part of the Association's work which concerns our congregational life. In your leader of Feb. 22nd you observe "The National Conference is the natural completion, in church-fellowship, of the district associations." Quite so; and the B. and F. in dealing with its assisted congregations, has always been anxious to work through the district associations, or in co-operation with them. Now, with the evolution of the Conference, it will naturally carry out the same principle on a national scale, and dispense its congregational grants through the executive of the National Conference. It will still be B. and F. work, though partly it will be done in the offices of the Conference; and it will be Conference work just as much, though the B. and F. will provide the funds.

This, of course, implies that the Conference is to extend its administrative

powers. Those powers have been extending since the day the Conference was formed, and it was impossible but that they should extend, to meet work which only the Conference can properly do. But the extension is no injury to the B. and F.: it is all the time a victory for the principles which the B. and F. was formed to promote. Justly honoured for the work it has already done for us, it will, in the days to come, be reckoned as its chief service to our churches that it originated the Conference to which we are looking for great help when these matters of procedure are satisfactorily arranged.

There are many other details in which the B. and F. will be able to best fulfil itself by working through the Conference organisation. One obvious matter is in regard to the May meetings. So far as they are deliberative, they fall within the first intention of the Conference; and it is only because the Conferences have been held triennially and in the provinces that the B. and F. has kept up its May meetings on the old scale. An annual set of meetings, say alternately in London and the provinces, would better suit our convenience and our necessities.

J. H. WEATHERALL.

SIR,—Your request for an opinion upon "Our Great Problem" must overcome any disinclination to prolong this discussion. Whether the matter be quite so great as we are inclined to represent one may venture, I think, to doubt. In face of the eternal issues of life and oncoming death, in presence of the real problems of pain and suffering, of prayer and immortality, it seems as though we are peddling and quibbling about trifling matters, and investing them with a preposterous importance. Is it a religious matter? Do our spiritual life and fervour suffer from weak method or wrong idea? Then does it become a great problem.

If any interested outsider has followed the correspondence so far, he may have felt provoked to remark, "These people know not what they are at." The tangle of opinion and suggestion is indeed intricate. Can we find any way out?

May we not eliminate from the argument at the very outset the personal belief element? No one, surely, can question that a man must form his own opinion, be his own theologian, attain some conclusion, articulate it into statement, accept some name to define it, advocate it in print and in private, and support individually some public society whose object is to publish and circulate it. To that extent is there any difference of opinion, or valid objection, with regard to the name Unitarian or the value of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association?

But this is *not* the question pressed upon us by the President of the Conference. His problem is a *Church* problem; his plea for a clearer understanding of our Church position, and a closer attention to our Church organisation; his appeal to the larger sentiments of corporate Church association, and common Church action.

What is our Church position? Two alternative principles solicit our choice. (1) A Unitarian Trust, a Unitarian Church, Unitarian Associations of Churches, Unitarian Sunday Schools, Unitarian temper-

ance, Unitarian cricket, a Unitarian sect. That is definite and right for those who believe in it. It is a *position*, consistent and distinct, easily applied to pew and pulpit, easily explained to the man in the street, and likely to attract the enthusiastic convert. One correspondent declares quite frankly that "the organisation of a church must be on a theology," and speaks of "each individual agreeing to Unitarian ideas, and each church having a congregation professing Unitarian ideas." (2) A Free Trust and a Free Church, the Open Door and the Open Way, a catholic appeal and a catholic ideal, a frank reliance on spiritual unity underlying theological diversity, and on the love of truth apart from agreement in result. That is also a *position*, tenable, explainable, and based on principle. It leaves room for the widest and clearest sympathy, and it certainly need not be a "nondescript religiosity."

We may take one or the other—not both. But the Unitarian Trusts are not many, whilst the Free Trusts represent the majority. To this extent our Church basis is fixed. Yet we cross and compromise, from expediency or perversity. A Free Trust is misrepresented by a Unitarian notice-board. Unitarianism is not imposed, but it is publicly implied. Doctrinal Associations ask collections from non-subscribing congregations; undelegated Societies usurp representative capacities. The inevitable result is confusion upon confusion in our methods, blurring of the issues, divided allegiance, doctrinal self-consciousness, reversal of the right emphasis, refusal to recognise religious liberalism in others because they do not come over to us or wear the labels we try to affix. Would that it were enough to admit that "we may be a little illogical." We are unprincipled and unfaithful. We are hiding away from ourselves, as well as from others, the basal principle of the Church Universal. We are bleeding out the life power of our Church idea; we are encouraging cross purposes, overlappings, and divided counsels in our organisations; substituting the sectional for that of the whole, obliterating the frontier line between theological opinion and spiritual union, allowing the first to annex and dominate the second because the spirit is weak and imprisoned, and the catholic principle misunderstood.

We are hindered by spiritual differences of Church conception and by practical difficulties of organisation. How shall we deal with them? I would reverse the advice that "we must hammer away at practical organisation in the hope that the true principles will emerge." We must hammer away first at our Church principles to secure for them more loyal adoption, and then try to work out our organisation into truer accordance with them. We must understand each other in friendly candour, and find out how far we can go together. We must realise that our collective Church responsibilities are not merely personal interests, but ecclesiastical forces. Never was it more needful to remove misconceptions and to realise our privileges. Let us have the courage of our Church principles. We must turn our negatives into positives. Non-subscription to common doctrine means full

adhesion to undogmatic church union. Intellectual freedom means spiritual obligation. Denial of the denominational means acceptance of the catholic ideal. Our centre of gravity should lie in the National Conference, which has both representative and executive powers, but is hampered by lack of means, hindered by conflicting claims, and unsupported by the churches at large. The engine has not yet got up steam. The proposals at Leeds and at Liverpool did not fail on any point of principle, but on questions of financial detail. Let all the churches support firstly, heartily, generously, on a united "Conference Sunday," their one national and representative body. Then we should not only deliberate, but act; not only discuss churches, but become a Church.

With this common church consciousness once alert and urgent in our midst, we should cease to sit at ease in our ecclesiastical chaos. We should unitedly grapple with each organic defect which our President has pointed out, and in a corporate, statesmanlike spirit. Our most acute and chronic troubles are weak congregations and their ill-paid ministers. To whom are they entitled to look for help? Surely to the church association to which they belong, and on which they have the right of representation. But the Conference has no funds, receives utterly inadequate collections, and can hence give no grants to either its provincial assemblies or its individual churches, and for only too obvious reasons. This means that it is crippled at all points from giving that practical and tangible help which our weaker churches most appreciate, and from backing them up in their attempt to become self-supporting and independent.

Two great things the Conference has produced—the Sustentation Fund and the Fund for Pension and Insurance—but in each case it has at once dropped its own responsibilities like hot coals, and let them be handed over to others. Amidst the many ironies which thwart our efforts and play tricks with our best laid plans, can any compare with this? What are our churches to conclude of their representative head which cannot aid them when they would, and will not aid them when it could!

The cry of the impatient is, "Let us get to work, and never mind who does it." But will that solve our problem? Our position owes its making, and also its continuation, to the impractical "practical" man. Work along what line, and with what aim? To criticise any works done amongst us must seem, of course, ungracious, and it is, indeed, a most reluctant task. But I have no faith whatever in either the devices of the mere opportunist, or the expedients of the compromiser. We must first get to the bottom of the matter and make our position quite clear. I am haunted by the conviction at every turn, that much of the religious liberalism which now surrounds us in varied form would have brought its adherents into our Free Trust Churches, had we not been erroneously looked upon as a Unitarian denomination. The old contention between the Unitarian and the Orthodox may still remain, yet it seems to some of us to pale in importance before

the far deeper, larger, and more crucial alternatives of Liberalism or dogmatic obedience, free inquiry or authority, private judgment or official statement, religion or no religion, the man who worships and looks up, and the man who worships not. A Free Trust is not only a historic heritage of which to boast, but a precious privilege to use ourselves and offer to others. It is the one thing which gives our churches their meaning, their mission, their justification, their vital idea, their hold on the future. It is the one principle which makes it worth while to serve them still and hold by them through all.

FRANK K. FREESTON.

SIR,—It must be clear to all who have followed the discussion, that it has completely drifted from the points raised by Mr. Wood, and absolutely failed to reach any points that can be debated with present advantage to our churches as a body. The question of *life and organisation* was itself quite simple of resolution. The life of our body is feeble in many ways, but it is life, and its organisation can be effected on lines, by no means revolutionary, which would soon lead to satisfactory development and increase. My conviction is that our great requirement is the more efficient construction of our district associations as missionary agents, and, following upon this, the institution as governing bodies of their constituent churches. This is the first stage in the solution of a problem which does not call for a great statesman.

WILLIAM C. HALL.

Birmingham.

SIR,—Does not the matter resolve itself into (1) How shall we generate a genuine strength, cohesive, as well as individual, amongst such as are already affiliated with our churches? (2) How shall we secure, as supporters of the organisations set for the advance of liberal religion, those large numbers of people whose intellectual assent is given to the conceptions we in general hold? (3) How (if and when secured) shall we hold them in an *unabated* energetic loyalty to our organisation?

The question of name has little to do with the solution of this problem. [A passage of the letter about names is here omitted.—Ed.] What we most need is a deeper appreciation of our privilege of uniting in religious worship and for religious work on the common understanding of individual liberty in the pursuit of religious truth. It is a position unique, wherein each can contribute his quota to the advancement of religious knowledge, and each help in the direction which most suits his individual ability, and that he should feel the obligation and necessity of that help. We need not expect those who are as yet not of us (but who are deeply impressed by the trend of thought in our direction, and look with longing eyes our way) to be drawn by the magnetism of our enthusiasm, when the enthusiasm is not there.

In every congregation there are always a few, at all events, who have this needed deep appreciation of our position, and see and understand our golden opportunity. They are loyal to our principles. They do not subscribe for a "sitting" only, but

occupy it. They join heart and soul and voice in worship, which is a genuine joy to them. They give up valuable time to further any good work of the church, and take living interest in the aims which legitimately belong to our religious organisations, and make continuous sacrifice to increase the power for good of the societies to which they belong, and so effectually build up the Christian life in their own hearts. These are the models which, being lifted up will draw others unto them, and us. Their efforts should be fully recognised, their hearts be cheered, their labours and sacrifices encouraged by every means—by ministers especially. In every congregation there are, unfortunately, "nominal" members, "finished Unitarians," who do nothing beyond what is absolutely necessary to maintain a respectable connection, worship is not necessary to them. They have got past that, if they attend, it is to air a complaint. If invited to serve in some needed post of duty, the work makes no appeal to them. Their presence is a hindrance, and a chill to the enthusiasm which, maintained, means victory. There should be no room for such, or it should be narrowed to its smallest area. Their influence is demoralising and disintegrating and the mischief they succeed in doing is beyond calculation. They should be put out of fashion, and not till this is done can there be harmony and progress. These two elements we need to reckon with, and, if we do not award each according to merit, there can never be the happy united enthusiastic effort which will recreate our churches, and make them into places where men and women love to congregate. The spirit of Archbishop Trench's lines (Hymn 298 of "Praise and Prayer") is what we need to make our churches and allied institutions scenes of the genuine religious life—

"Pour forth the oil—pour boldly forth,

It will not fail, until

Thou fairest vessels to provide

Which it may largely fill.

Make channels for the streams of love,

Where they may broadly run,

And love has overflowing streams,

To fill them every one.

But, if at any time we cease

Such channels to provide,

The very fountains of love for us

Will soon be parched and dried.

For we must share, if we would keep,

That blessing from above;

Ceasing to give, we cease to have:

Such is the law of love."

ALEX. OSBORNE ASHWORTH.

Belfast, February 24, 1908.

SIR,—Before the correspondence on the subject of "Our Great Problem" is closed, I should like to say a word to help matters if I can. Many people do not know how ill they are until someone, who has sympathy and skill to diagnose their condition, informs them of the fact. Our churches owe a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Wood for the sympathy and skill he has displayed in diagnosing our condition. I suppose no church in particular likes to be told where it ails, nor what remedy ought to be adopted to cure its disease.

Mr. Wood is our spiritual doctor, but his diagnosis and medicine is not universally

appreciated. That may be so now, but the time will come, and is not far distant, when people will say, "Mr. Wood was right." For my part, I believe that organisation of almost any sort would be more easy if only people had the new heart and the right spirit. Everyone knows that difference of religious opinion, different degrees of religious feeling, and different ideas as to methods of organisation must of necessity abound. And no one would desire to see a dull and deadly monotony of thought and practice take the place of the sparkle and charm of variety. What is most needed among us is a deeper, truer, more sincere sympathy and generosity of feeling, which shall enable us to work and pray with others *even though their methods and forms are not quite our own*. Some of us have not yet learned that underneath all forms of expression of religious belief there is a *common aspiration*. Most people who attach themselves to any religious organisation or church feel in varying degrees that between the soul and God, between the human and the Divine, there ought to be, and is, some real communion. When people begin to say *how* that relation or communion may be established and maintained, then they differ. But, as far as I am concerned, such a difference does not hinder true sympathy and fellowship. For underneath all differences of expression people admit the same essential need of the human soul for a greater, diviner strength than its own. The trouble with most of us is exactly what Mr. Wood points out. We suffer from an exaggerated sense of our own importance so that we cannot or will not work with others unless they think and act exactly as *we* wish. Surely our religion, if we did but understand it better, ought to make such thoughts and conduct impossible.

The attempt to organise "the Universal Church" under one name, or to persuade men to express their religious feelings through the medium of one formula, is as needless as it is futile. What we need above all is that a *man should prove his faith* (whatever it be) *by his life*, and if we all tried to do that, the simple reforms and methods of reorganisation suggested by Mr. Wood would be found easy and practical. Do let us give up the stupid quarrel about names. We shall never find *one* name to satisfy everybody; and what right-minded person cares what name you give to a religion so long as the fruit of that religion be manifestly good? There are many practical schemes about the value of which few people differ, and in which we could all unite, if only there was a greater readiness among us to fall in with the schemes proposed. We are afraid to make experiments. And in the meantime many of our churches go from bad to worse. Such questions, for instance, as the basis of church membership, the better co-operation and fellowship of neighbouring churches, the raising of a common fund for the augmentation of ministers' stipends by the simplest of all methods, viz., the "Weekly Penny Fund," such questions as these ought not to present any practical difficulty to people who profess religion and brotherhood.

The raising of money has always been a stumbling-block, and so it will be, so long as people are unwilling to give money to a cause without getting something in return. The spirit of the age is commercial, not sacrificial. The commercial spirit has so taken possession of churches, that many of them can scarcely be maintained without bazaars, whist drives, entertainments, teas and the like. Now, until people change their minds and their hearts towards this matter, things will never be right with us. Those who adopt these methods do so, of course, with the best intentions, believing them to be sound methods, but time alone will prove how mistaken and wasteful they are, and how they indirectly foster the sensation that the church is more of the nature of a social club than a place for the development and encouragement of spiritual and moral life.

The social side of a church's life, however needful it be, should always be kept in its right place, viz., second, if the church is to maintain its true function and not to become a social club.

When we have grown into a deeper, fuller, richer, spiritual life, first things will come first, and organisation, social service, and co-operation will be as natural and easy as they now are almost impossible.

ELLISON ANNESLEY VOYSEY.

Northampton.

SIR,—It is to be regretted that the letters on this subject have been of so little practical value; but this is only to be expected when but one side has been heard, and I need not remind your readers that the discussion has been almost entirely confined to our ministers, and those ministers representative chiefly of a small (if not unduly reticent) group. It is to be regretted, too, that so much of the discussion has turned upon a change of name, a question, I venture to think, quite outside the range of practical politics, for there are few of us who are anxious to get out of the "Unitarian rut" (I thank Mr. Wood for teaching us that word) to flounder in the moving bog of Free Catholicism, or enter the Church of the Open Way (which title I observe you have recently taken under your protection as a sort of registered trade mark) or embrace the "Open Brotherhood" advocated by your doubtless well-meaning, but somewhat unintelligible advertiser of last week.

Personally I had hoped that something in the way of organisation might come from Dr. Martineau's proposals; but what he was unable to effect I am sure Mr. Wood and his friends have no chance of bringing off. Moreover, the feeling towards the Conference was very different then from what it is to-day. To be perfectly candid, and I speak without any wish or intention to give offence, the vast majority of our laymen, and I think I may say of our ministers too, have no confidence in either the aims or the methods of those whose influence is at present predominant in the Conference, and I will even venture to go further and say that if the meeting which gave that body power to enter upon practical work (as

you recently reminded us) could be held over again, it would not, in the light of subsequent events, grant that authority. If anything were wanting to prove my assertion we have it in the difficulty which exists (notwithstanding circulars and presidential visit-) in raising funds for Conference needs, as recently illustrated by Mr. Wood's somewhat disingenuous suggestion that the balance of the weekly subscriptions, which he seeks to obtain with the object of increasing ministerial stipends, should be applied to eke out the Conference income. Surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird. The words and actions in recent years of a small section of our ministers (and I venture to remind them that our body has never taken kindly to a priesthood) and of a still smaller section of our laymen, has postponed any general organisation of our churches for at least twenty years, and I can only suggest that they should for the present drop their schemes, and join with the rest of us in practical work.

JOHN C. WARREN.

[In this discussion up to the present week, after the President's opening, ten ministers have taken part and nine of the laity. When Mr. Warren says that "but one side has been heard," we can only ask, Has he read the letters? Our columns have been open, and remain open, for full discussion of all sides of this question, but we deprecate the introduction into it of hot prejudice and of unfair personalities.—ED. INQ.]

FIDEISM.

THE very interesting movement known as the Paris School of Theology, or *Symbolo-Fideism*, may now be studied in the neat booklet which has been translated by an adherent of our own liberal faith.* The author, M. Ménégoz, was the friend of the founder of this school, the late Auguste Sabatier, and entered sympathetically into his ways of thought. We may therefore take the two essays which compose the book as a recent and authoritative statement. (They were delivered to a Society of Pastors in 1906 and 1907.) One notices, at the outset, the difference between Sabatier's freer and more literary handling and that of his successor, which is somewhat harder in form, and more in the ordinary theological manner. Sabatier was really a finely penetrating spirit, and like all such men, he wielded a power quite in excess of the importance and validity of his particular views. It is only when we relapse upon the "cut-and-dried" statement of the master's views as they shape themselves in the formal system of his inheritors, that we realise how much was owing to the ampler ether which he breathed, and which was, apparently, incommunicable. The inevitable fixation, however, of fluid and formative ideas brings to us the task of estimating the value of their contribution to the thought of our time. In the case of this new French Protestantism, it is, to say the least, very doubtful whether its general foundations are well and truly laid.

* "Religion and Theology." By E. Ménégoz. Translated by Mary Thorpe. (Williams & Norgate. 1s. net.)

Sabatier and his followers, in their revolt from orthodoxy, have been, in the first place, much impressed by the evils arising out of the entangling alliance of the Christian religion with obsolete science, untrue history, and inadequate philosophy. Then, they conclude, is it not the obvious remedy for these evils that we henceforth dissociate such ill-matched allies and declare religion to dwell in a safe region quite fenced off from these perils? If the religious and the secular elements of man's life are always coming into conflict with each other, is it not better to make a rigid separation between the religious and the secular; and this not only as an expedient policy, but as part of our profoundest view of Reality? Accordingly, these writers find the origin and the witness for religion not in our reasoning powers, but in the God-consciousness; not in existential-judgments, but in value-judgments; not in the head, but in the heart. "On the one hand," says M. Ménégoz, "with our religious consciousness we judge the things of a religious nature; on the other hand, we judge of secular things with our natural reason. . . . This conviction liberates our conscience from the scientific, historic, and philosophic data that orthodoxy would present to us as constituent elements of the Christian faith." Probably most of us, however, will think that such a victory for religion is won in a suspiciously facile manner. And, in fact, we shall not be wrong in expecting that it will have to be paid for by a heavy retribution. For it only saves religion by making it irrational. If religion is not to be tried at the bar of reason, then good-bye to all hope either of overcoming superstition or of establishing for religion a claim upon men's "reasonable service." Value-judgments are very well, but how do they stand in relation to objective fact and reality? If they stand (as religious men are bound to believe that they do stand) as authentic witnesses to the very pillars of the universe and the divine meaning of life, this requires to be maintained, and it can only be maintained by some sort of philosophy. That philosophy is "secular" will be no bar to it in the eyes of men who believe that no secular thing need be irreligious. The rigid division of religious and secular is, indeed, one of the worst drawbacks to the teaching of M. Ménégoz. And even he shrinks from being ruthlessly consistent. For it is plain that he has his own philosophy after all, and, like so many other "liberals," only decries theology and philosophy when they happen to be those of other people. It is well known that Sabatier founded himself mainly upon Kant, and M. Ménégoz evidently does the same. Speaking of Kant's philosophy, he says: "To-day we are surrounded by its influence, and our theology is bound also to feel it. It (theology) has to adapt itself, as our ancestors adapted their ideas to the principles of Platonism." What could be truer or more relevant to the case? But it is clearly inconsistent with what has gone before, and with the whole general thesis of M. Ménégoz, which is that Religion and Theology must be held apart. The fact is, this separation will not work. Religion always has had and always will have a Theology. The antithesis Religion

versus Theology is a thoroughly false one. The real opposition is not between religion and theology, but between a more true and a less true theology. If the French Protestants are going to accept M. Ménégoz's antithesis, they will throw away the whole lesson so hardly won by our own group of churches—their loss and feebleness through want of definiteness. That they are in danger of this is seen, moreover, in the rejection, in this book, of "history" as well as philosophy. One would have thought that scholars would have better learnt the lesson of the nineteenth century—the "historical" century *par excellence*, as distinguished from the eighteenth. In this matter the Paris school diverge from the Ritschlians. There is sometimes a failure to observe the radical difference between them (as in *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1903, p. 554). The Ritschlians share some mistakes with the Frenchmen, but at least they see that the religious consciousness of men is not a capricious mystical ecstasy, without historical basis or standard. It is perhaps the most disappointing feature of the French school that it has no interest in that interweaving of individual minds and lives into a great historic movement which makes Christianity so much *more* (not *less*) than a philosophy. Readers will be disheartened to find M. Ménégoz using the argument that if we make our faith depend on history it will be shattered if the history is found false. No doubt if by "history" we mean Miracles or other external episodes, the religion which rests on them is doubtfully poised. But if by "history" we mean the history of man's Soul, then we cannot avoid letting our view of it enter constitutively into our total religious outlook. Christianity is the greatest episode in the history of man's Soul. We have to run the risk of its being true or not. But we are under no greater disability in this respect than we are when we take the risk of accepting our reason or our conscience as guides, or our social relationships as a fundamental fact of our situation. We can no more keep history out of religion than we can jump off our own shadow. All the good we have is mediated. A spirit must use a body.

The same kind of criticism must be directed upon the second essay, in which M. Ménégoz deals with Salvation and Forgiveness, and contrasts the teaching of Paul with that of Jesus. Jesus declares the free, broad, unconditioned mercy of God our Heavenly Father, while Paul brings in difficult theories and perplexing Rabbinisms. Jesus is natural. Paul is legal and theosophical. Jesus teaches from the heart, Paul is scholastic. Jesus says that God is merciful because He has a father's heart. "St. Paul, with his subtle mind, formed by the logic of the schools, could not rest contented with such an elementary, though profoundly religious, answer." Here, once more, M. Ménégoz shows the tendency to harden and exaggerate a comparison into absolute antagonism. Jesus must belong to the Fideist school which rejects (or thinks that it rejects) philosophy, and the unphilosophical Jesus must triumph over the philosophical Paul. For this purpose, Paul's teachings about the redeeming work of Christ have

to be exhibited on the rigid lines of a system which is practically that of the great dogmatists who built up the schemes of substitution and expiation, and who, according to our author, must be acquitted of any charge of wresting Paul's meaning to their own ends. So the position which liberalism has long fought for, that the dogmatists have misunderstood and travestied Paul, is surrendered, and they are right, after all! "Paul's doctrine has permeated official ecclesiastical teaching, and has become the orthodox doctrine." No allowance is made for figurative and fluid forms of speech. Paul is just a Lutheran doctor. He is to be understood to teach Imputed Righteousness, and when he says "Christ died for us" he means "died instead of us." Probably these positions only need to be stated in order to be rejected, for no explanation of Paul can be satisfactory which does not show how true and deep was his grasp of the mind of Christ. And on the other hand, the attempt to explain away the words of Jesus into the colourless maxims of modern ethicisms must be equally futile. It will be extremely interesting to watch the courses taken by the new French school, for there can be no mistake that it is deeply in earnest and is served by men of strenuous mind and fine equipment.

W. WHITAKER.

PROVINCIAL LETTER.

THE MIDLANDS.

THE last letter you published from the Midlands was in December, 1906, fifteen months ago. The religious world had been recently excited by the announcement from the pulpit of the City Temple of the so-called New Theology, which has since been the text for countless newspaper and magazine articles extending almost to the present day. Birmingham has taken her share in the controversy as represented by Mr. Austin in his little volume published last autumn called "Unitarian Christianity and the New Theology," based on addresses delivered in the Church of the Messiah, and by Bishop Gore in a series of lectures delivered in the Birmingham Cathedral last spring and recently published in book-form as "The New Theology and the Old Religion." Only ten days ago a number of leading Congregationalists (including Mr. Jowett of Carr's-lane, Birmingham), who have been chairmen of their Union or heads of their Colleges, thought it well "in the theological unrest which has invaded the churches" to make a brief statement of some things believed among them which required "at the present time emphatic affirmation," and they published in the newspapers a confession of faith under seven heads addressed to the Congregational churches of the country. Mr. Campbell referred to this manifesto from the pulpit the day after and spoke of the futility of trying to allay the unrest which was deplored, characterising it as the resurgence of faith and the revival of Christianity.

In taking a rapid survey of the life of our Midland churches during the last fifteen months, I note with much regret that the *Seed Sower* has come to an end. I feel

sure that this useful and interesting magazine will be greatly missed by many of our friends, both in the district and out of it. It is fifteen years this month since it first saw the light, and I hope it will not be long before a successor appears on the scene. A glance down the calendar in the first number will show that only six out of the twenty-two ministers of the district at that time still occupy the pulpits they then held. I fear the editorial work had become to great a strain upon Mr. Wood's energy, with his other engagements, but we owe a debt of gratitude to him for having so successfully conducted the affairs of the publication for so many years. In his capacity of president of the Triennial Conference he has been going about the country preaching the gospel ("in forty churches," he says), day after day, and week after week with ceaseless energy and devotion. He has marked the beginning of the present year in your columns by a long, critical, and none too cheerful address on "Our Great Problem," by which he means the problem of the weakness of our churches. He admits that want of vitality is not peculiar to our own community. A critic of the Church of England Year-Book in the *Guardian* a year ago states that the statistics printed in that book are "sadly disquieting." He says, "In the spiritual side of church life we are not only not increasing relatively to the growth of the population, but at the best we are stationary, and at the worst we are slipping behind."

Mr. Wood's retirement from posts of usefulness in the public work of the city suggests the wish that another representative of our body may rise up and follow the good example he has set in years gone by. One also recalls the ministry of Dr. Crosskey with the hope that some day the minister of the Church of the Messiah may again become a power in the city in matters pertaining to the highest interests of the community outside the immediate work of the Church. The members of the Church of the Messiah are being exercised in their minds by a proposal to change the present forms of service. They have been in use more than nine years, and the congregation have grown accustomed to them, and it is difficult to compare them with the new forms which have only been used for a few months, and do justice to both. A "free" service, as an alternative, is now being tried till the end of this month. Mr. Tranter, the hard-working home-missionary, has over-taxed his strength and had to leave home for awhile. I hear he has gone to the Holy Land, and will, no doubt, profit to the fullest extent by his visit to a country of such supreme interest. I cannot pass by without notice the loss which the Church of the Messiah has recently sustained in the death of Mrs. Nettlefold. She was one of the most regular attendants at the services, and one of the most generous contributors to the funds of the church and its institutions; no one took a deeper interest than she in all matters connected with Unitarianism.

Before passing from matters of interest in Birmingham, it should be noted that another congregation has been added to those belonging to the Midland Christian Union during the past year. I refer to Moseley, which is under the care of the Rev. T. A. Gorton. His congregation meets

in the Dennis-road Council schools. Waverley-road will soon have completed its first three years under Mr. Hall. Our friends there are much to be congratulated upon the improved state of affairs realised under his guidance.

I should like to refer in a few words to a citizen of Birmingham, who did not belong to our household of faith, who has recently passed away. To him the city owes in no small degree the improvement in its condition from the point of view of cleanliness and health, as compared with the state of things of thirty years ago.

I allude to the late Alderman Sir William Cook. Largely through his own personal efforts the death rate of the city was reduced in about thirty years from 26 per thousand to a little under 17 per thousand of the population. Taking the present population at about 540,000, this means that instead of 14,000 dying in the year the number has been reduced to 9,000, a difference of 5,000, equal to the population of a small town. This saving of bodies is surely the first step towards the saving of souls. It may also be interesting to mention that the Salvation Army three months ago opened a home in Birmingham for social work among destitute men. A night's lodging is provided and food supplied at nominal charges, and employment is found if possible. I understand that since November 1 of last year about 1,400 men a week on an average have been lodged, many of them taken from the street in a starving condition.

Three pulpits in the district have changed ministers since the end of 1906, viz., Walsall, West Bromwich, and Whitchurch, and the pulpit at Dudley will be vacant at the end of April.

The Wolverhampton congregation, under the energetic leadership of Mr. Shaw, have taken the first steps towards building a new church. The Nursing Institution, wishing to enlarge their building in Bath-road, which adjoins the chapel and school, approached the Church Committee on the subject, and the negotiations resulted in a sale of the property to the Institution, in exchange for a sum of money and a new site in Park-road West a good deal larger than the present one. As stated in your columns in November last, a good start towards raising funds was made at a sale of work held at the end of October. The congregation have liberty to remain where they are for three years longer if they find it convenient to do so.

Signs of life are not wanting in other churches in the Union. In April of last year a new organ was opened in the chapel at Oldbury, and a tablet to the memory of the Rev. Henry McKean was unveiled the same evening. I am the proud possessor of a beautiful silver key which was given to me on that occasion, and with which I unlocked the organ. In October, our friends at Kidderminster had the gratification of seeing the completion of their Congregational Hall, which they will, no doubt, find to be of the greatest use in connection with the work of the New Meeting.

"In some of the districts I have visited, no complaint has been more pathetic than that of solitariness." So writes Mr. Wood in the second portion of his article on "Our Great Problem," meaning, no doubt,

the solitariness of a church, which one can realise as being closely allied to that of an individual, though not so acutely felt. We shall hope to hear something on this subject from Mr. Bowie on Monday week, when he comes to address the annual meeting of the Union at the Church of the Messiah on "The Grouping of Churches." Mr. Wood is to preach at night.

HERBERT NEW.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES.

[Notes and Reports for this Department should be as brief as possible, and be sent in by Wednesday, or Thursday Morning at latest.]

Cirencester.—On Sunday evening last, a Sacred Service of Song, entitled "Faith, Hope, and Love" took the place of the usual service. The connective readings were taken from Prof. Henry Drummond's book: "The Greatest Thing in the World," and were very beautiful and impressive. Although snow-storms raged, there was a good attendance.

Crewkerne.—The annual entertainment in connection with the Sunday-school took place on Wednesday and Thursday at the Town Hall, and was an unprecedented success, the number seeking admission being so large that an extra performance had to be given on Saturday. Upwards of 1,600 persons paid for admission. The musical play "Aladdin in Japan," was the piece selected for representation, and the training of the scholars had been so thorough that the performance was of a very high order, reflecting the greatest credit on the scholars and on Mrs. Sutcliffe who had trained them. These annual entertainments by the scholars have become quite an event in the district, and though they involve an enormous amount of work in preparation they undoubtedly do much real good. No secret is made of the fact that they are got up by Unitarians, and we are splendidly supported by some of the leading members of nearly all the denominations.

Gloucester.—On Sunday, February 23, the Rev. Rudolf Davis, B.A., entered on his ministry at Barton-street Chapel, in succession to the late Rev. Walter Lloyd. The origin of the congregation was in Commonwealth days, under the ministry of James Forbes. The present chapel dates from 1699. The *Gloucester Journal* of February 29 published a good notice of the new minister, with a portrait, and a friendly reference to his settlement in Gloucester.

Leigh.—The third annual young people's subscription party was held in the schoolroom of the Twist-lane Church on Saturday, Feb. 22, about 130 sitting down to tea. At the entertainment which followed, the Mayor (Councillor George Hunter, J.P.) presided. In the course of a friendly address he said he regretted exceedingly that the proposed interchange of pulpits among the Free Churches of the town did not include the name of their own minister. He felt this all the more keenly because there was a time when his own little church in the Avenue was not included, but that had been rectified, and if he had been present at the meeting he would have opposed any scheme which did not include all the Free Churches of the town. He was sure that if Mr. Redfern was invited to any of the pulpits of the Non-conformist churches he would not say anything that would give offence even to the most sensitive; and he had equal confidence that anyone they might have in the Unitarian pulpit would be equally sensible. He would like to see the time when they might have an interchange of pulpits among all the churches, including the Established Church. He should have no hesitation in occupying the pulpit at the Unitarian Church, believing that there is sufficient common ground upon which all Christians could unite, and room enough for everyone to preach the essential truths of the religion of Jesus without attacking the beliefs that were held by any particular community. He did not really know what all the trouble about orthodoxy and heresy meant: to him the one essential thing was the good life. He had just been reading an address that was delivered the previous day at

a Unitarian conference at Liverpool, and he found that importance was given by the speaker to exactly the same things as those to which they attached supreme importance, namely, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. That to him was the essential principle by which they should strive to live. The Rev. J. J. Wright and the Rev. Dr. Karfoot, J.P., also took part in the proceedings. In submitting a cordial vote of thanks to the Mayor, the Rev. R. S. Redfern warmly welcomed the suggestion that he should some day preach for them at Twist-lane, and it was subsequently arranged that he should do so on Sunday evening, April 19. The meeting was a great success, the financial result being a profit of over £15.

London: Stamford-street.—At the Band of Hope and Mercy Meeting, on Monday last, a deputation of members of the Stoke Newington-green Band of Hope, under the direction of their superintendent, Miss Titford, provided an excellent little programme of part songs, solos, and recitations. Miss Titford also gave a short illustrated address, emphasising the maxim, "Union is Strength." An audience of 106 accorded very hearty thanks to their visitors.

Stockton-on-Tees.—The Quarterly Conference of the Tees-side Sunday-schools and Guilds' Union was held at Stockton. A paper on "Leakage and its Remedy" was read by Rev. R. H. Maister, after which there was an interesting discussion, in which several members of the home and Middlesbro' churches took part. The president, Rev. S. S. Brettell, and Rev. W. H. Lambelle also addressed the meeting. Refreshments were provided, and the members spent a very pleasant evening. On a previous evening Rev. W. H. Lambelle delivered an interesting lecture, entitled "From Liverpool to Niagara," illustrated by limelight views, to the members of "Our Guild."

Taunton.—The eldest son of the Rev. Edward Parry, until recently minister at Ilminster, passed the London matriculation examination in January. He is a pupil at Taunton school.

Tenterden.—On Tuesday and Wednesday, February 25 and 26, a bazaar was held in aid of the funds of the Old Meeting House. It was opened on the first day by the Mayoress, Mrs. E. Howard, when Mr. J. E. Mace, J.P., proposed and Mr. H. B. Mace seconded a cordial vote of thanks. The Mayor, in responding, said the congregation of the Old Chapel had always been forward in good works and public service in the town, and he was confident they would continue to be so. The Old Meeting House represented a school of religious thought, which included many of the greatest thinkers and most eminent men in the country, and he rejoiced that it was still holding its own in the town. Next day Mrs. Conybeare Craven was the opener, and the vote of thanks was again moved by Mr. Mace, seconded by the Rev. H. Rylett.

Wolverhampton.—At the recent annual meeting of the congregation of All Souls' Church a pleasing ceremony took place, in the shape of the presentation of a purse of money to Mrs. Ann Fullwood, on her retirement from the office of caretaker, after having served the church faithfully and conscientiously for nearly half a century. The presentation was made by the oldest member of the congregation, Mr. H. Ricket, who paid a worthy tribute to the loyalty and zeal of Mrs. Fullwood, and his remarks were supplemented by feeling words from several other members, and the minister, Rev. J. A. Shaw.

THAT becomes more certain to each of us which another attests as *his* experience also, and that which might be timid or false if kept secret and alone, is raised to its full energy when felt to break forth from the common heart of man.—*J. H. Thom.*

THE Rev. W. A. Weatherall writes to say that at the Liverpool meetings he did not represent the Irish Non-subscribing Association, as stated in our report, but only his own congregation at Crumlin.

WE delight to hear our own inward consciousness, the divinest secrets of our nature, openly attested by the full general voice. We meet in the Christian Church mainly to give one another these testimonies. We each contribute our own spark of faith and inward consciousness to raise the fire of the religious life, and to be warmed at it ourselves. And he who withholds this is no true member of a church; no life flows to him, or flows from him.—*J. H. Thom.*

To myself, the most effectual church is that in which I see the signs of Christian affection in those around me, in which warm hearts are beating on every side, in which a deep stillness speaks of the absorbed soul, in which I recognise fellow-beings who in common life have impressed me with their piety. One look from a beaming countenance, one tone in singing from a deeply moved heart, perhaps aids me more than the sermon. When nothing is said, I feel it good to be among the devout; and I wonder not that the Quakers in some of their still meetings profess to hold the most intimate union, not only with God, but with each other.—*Channing.*

OUR CALENDAR.

It is requested that notice of any alteration in the Calendar be sent to the Publisher not later than Thursday Afternoon.

SUNDAY, March 8.

LONDON.

Acton, Creffield-road, 11 and 7, Rev. ARTHUR HURN.
Bermondsey, Fort-road, 7, Rev. JESSE HIPPERSON.
Blackfriars Mission and Stamford-street Chapel, 11 and 7, Rev. J. C. BALLANTYNE.
Brixton, Unitarian Christian Church, Effra-road, 11 and 7, Rev. F. HANKINSON.
Child's Hill, All Souls', Weech-road, Finchley road, 11.15 and 6.30, Rev. EDGAR DAPLYN.
Croydon, Free Christian Church, Wellesley-road, 11 and 7, Rev. W. J. JUPP.
Deptford, Church-street, 11.15 and 6.30, Rev. A. J. MARCHANT.
Essex Church, The Mall, Notting Hill Gate, 11 and 6.30, Rev. R. N. CROSS, M.A.
Forest Gate, corner of Dunbar-road, Upton-lane, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. WOODS PERRIS.
Hackney, New Gravel Pit Church, Chatham-place, 11.15 and 7, Rev. H. RAWLINGS, M.A.
Hampstead, Rosslyn-hill Chapel, 11.15 and 6.30, Rev. H. GOW, B.A.
Highgate Hill, Unitarian Christian Church, 11 and 7, Rev. A. A. CHARLESWORTH.
Ilford, Assembly Rooms, Broadway, 7, Rev. T. E. M. EDWARDS.
Islington, Unity Church, Upper-street, 11 and 7, Rev. E. SAVELL HICKS, M.A.
Kentish Town, Clarence-road, N.W., 11.15 and 7, Rev. C. E. PIKE.
Kilburn, Quex-road, 11 and 7, Rev. CHARLES ROOPER, B.A.
Lewisham, Unitarian Christian Church, High-street, 11 and 7, Rev. W. W. C. POPE.
Little Portland-street Chapel, 11.15 and 7, Rev. J. PAGE HOPPS.

Mansford-street Church and Mission, Bethnal Green, 7, Rev. GORDON COOPER.
Peckham, Avondale-road, 11, Rev. J. HIPPERSON; 6.30, Mr. D. DELTA EVANS.
Plumstead, Common-road Unitarian Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. L. JENKINS JONES.
Richmond, Free Church, Ormond-road, 11.15 and 7, Rev. FELIX TAYLOR, B.A.
Stepney Green, College Chapel, 11, Mr. W. R. MARSHALL; 7, Mr. EDWARD CAPLETON.
Stoke Newington Green, 11.15 and 7.
Stratford Unitarian Church, 11, Mr. SEYMOUR MARKS; 6.30, Mr. R. W. PETTINGER.
Sydenham School of Art, Vanner-road, 7, Rev. G. CRITCHLEY, B.A.
Wandsworth Unitarian Christian Church, East Hill, 11 and 7, Rev. W. G. TARRANT, B.A.
Wimbledon, Smaller Worple Hall, 7, Rev. D. BALSILLIE.
Wood Green, Unity Church, 11, Rev. Dr. MUMERY.

ABERYSTWITH, New Street Meeting House, 11 and 6.30, Mr. D. ROBERTSON DAVIES.
BATH, Trim-street Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. M. McDOWELL.
BLACKPOOL, Dickson-road, North Shore, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. ROBERT MCGEE.
BLACKPOOL, South Shore Unitarian Free Church, Lytham-road South, 11 and 6.30.
BOURNEMOUTH, Unitarian Church, West Hill-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. C. C. COE.
BRIGHTON, Free Christian Church, New-road, North-street, 11 and 7, Rev. J. J. MARTEN.
BUXTON, Hartington-road Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. GEORGE STREET.
CAMBRIDGE, Assembly Rooms, Downing-street, 11.30, Rev. G. C. CRESSEY, D.D.
CANTERBURY, Ancient Chapel, Blackfriars, 10.50, Rev. J. H. SMITH.
CHESTER, Matthew Henry's Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. D. JENKIN EVANS.
DOVER, Adrian-street, near Market-square, 11 and 6.30, Rev. C. A. GINEVER.
DUBLIN, Stephen's Green West, 12, Rev. G. H. VANCE, B.D.
GUILDFORD, Ward-street Church, North-street, 11, "The Vision of the Pure Heart"; 6.30, "Prayer in all Ages." Mr. GEORGE WARD.
HASTINGS, South Terrace, Queen's-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. S. BURROWS.
HORSHAM, Free Christian Church, Worthing-road, 11 and 6.30.
LEEDS, Mill Hill, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. HERBERT MCLACHLAN, M.A., B.D. (Evening only.)
LEICESTER, Free Christian Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. GERTRUD VON PETZOLD.
LISCARD, Memorial Church, Manor-road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ERNEST PARRY.
LIVERPOOL, Ancient Chapel of Toxteth, 11 and 6.30, Rev. CHARLES CRADDOCK.
LIVERPOOL, Hope-street Church, 11 and 6.30.
LIVERPOOL, Ullet-road, Sefton Park, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. C. ODGERS, B.A.
MAIDSTONE, Unitarian Church, Earl-street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ALEXANDER FARQUHARSON.
NEWPORT, Isle of Wight, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. M. LIVENs.
OXFORD, Manchester College, 11.30, Rev. RHONDDA WILLIAMS.
PORTSMOUTH, High-street Chapel, 11 and 6.45, Rev. JAMES BURTON, M.A.
PORTSMOUTH, St. Thomas-street, 11 and 6.45, Mr. T. BOND.
SCARBOROUGH, Westborough, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. OTTWEILL BINNS.
SEVENOAKS, Bessell's Green, The Old Meeting House, 11, Rev. F. T. REED.
SHEFFIELD, Upper Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. C. J. STREET, M.A., LL.B.
SIDMOUTH, Old Meeting, High-street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. WILLIAM AGAR.
SOUTHPORT, Portland-street Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. MATTHEW R. SCOTT.
TORQUAY, Unity Hall, Lower Union-street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. A. E. O'CONNOR, B.D.
TUNBRIDGE WELLS, Mechanics' Institute, Dudley-road, 11, Mr. ARTHUR RICKETT, LL.D.
"Character and Destiny."
WEST KIRBY, Tynwald Hall, opposite Station, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. W. HAWKES.

SOUTH AFRICA.

CAPETOWN, Free Protestant (Unitarian) Church, Hout-street, 6.45, Rev. RAMSDEN BALM-FORTH.

BIRTH.

GALLUP.—On February 23, at Bereleigh, East Meon, Hants, the wife of H. Curtis Gallup, of a daughter.

MARRIAGE.

MURRELL—FORDHAM.—On March 3, at the Church of the Ascension, Arden, Manitoba, by the Rev. G. T. Spriggs, Edward Charles Fenn Murrell, elder son of E. G. H. Murrell, of Erpingham Lodge, Ingworth, Norfolk, to Constantia Edith Fordham, eldest daughter of Herbert George Fordham, of Odsey, Cambridgeshire. [By Cable.]

DEATHS.

LEE.—February 29, at Regent's-park, London, Rawdon Briggs, second son of the late Rev. George Lee, of Kendal, and formerly of Hull.

GRUNDY.—On March 1, Relpb, the beloved son of Mr. and Mrs. J. R. G. Grundy.

MANSFORD STREET CHURCH AND MISSION.

The ANNUAL MEETING of friends and subscribers will take place on Tuesday evening, March 17, at the

Rosslyn Hill Chapel Room, Hampstead, Tea and Coffee, 7.30 p.m.

The Chair will be taken at 8.0 by the Rev. J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, M.A., Litt.D.

S. W. PRESTON, } Secretaries.
R. P. JONES, }

SUSTENTATION FUND FOR THE AUGMENTATION OF MINISTERS' STIPENDS.

Secretaries of Congregations desiring Grants from this Fund may obtain the needful forms of application by writing, before 31st March next, to—

FRANK PRESTON, Hon. Sec.,
Meadowcroft, North Finchley,
London, N.

TYPEWRITING.—Young Lady, expert steno-typist, and highly recommended for literary work, undertakes Typewriting. Special care taken with author's MSS., and absolute accuracy guaranteed. 9d. per 1,000 words; with carbon copy, 1s. per 1,000. Specimen of work submitted.—Miss ARCHER, 14, St. Andrew's-chambers, Wells-street, Oxford-street, London, W.

TYPEWRITING.

Telephone at once for estimates for your Typewriting, Duplicating, and Copying. Commercial Correspondence a speciality. First-class work at moderate charges.

C. HERBERT CÆSAR,
10, Grange Road, Canonbury, London, N.
Secrecy guaranteed. Special terms for permanent work.
TELEPHONE: 1219 NORTH.

NEVER FORGET.

LIFE IS EXPECTING MUCH OF THEE.

By MATILDA SHARPE.

25TH EDITION.

As usual, plenty more matter, pages fuller.

POST FREE, ONE SHILLING.

A. HOLNESS, 14, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
OR ESSEX HALL, ESSEX STREET, W.C.

TO AUTHORS

ARE YOU SATISFIED with your typed MSS.? If you are, this does not concern you. IF YOU ARE NOT, then please write for my terms at once.

I quote fair prices, and I compete in QUALITY OF WORK. First 2,000 words FREE as a trial.

MISS M. HOEY,

2, Fairfax Road, South Hampstead, N.W.

KINGSLEY HOTEL

(TEMPERANCE),

HART ST., BLOOMSBURY SQUARE, LONDON.

Near the British Museum.

This well-appointed and commodious Hotel has passenger Lift; Electric Light in all Rooms; Bathrooms on every Floor; Spacious Dining, Drawing, Writing, Reading, Smoking and Billiard Rooms; All Floors Fireproof; Perfect Sanitation; Night Porter. Telephone. Bedrooms (including attendance) from 3s. 6d. to 6s. per night. Inclusive charge for Bedroom, Attendance, Table d'Hôte Breakfast and Dinner, from 8s. 6d. to 10s. 6d. per day.

Full Tariff and Testimonials on application.
Telegraphic Address "Bookcraft," London.

Established 50 Years.

Callard & Bowser's
Butter-Scotch

"Really
Wholesome Confectionery"
—LASCET.

A sweetmeat for all, and may be given
with confidence to the youngest child.
In paper packets and tin boxes—
various sizes.

Manufactory: London, W.C.

THE INTERNATIONAL.

No. 4. (March). Now Ready. 1/- net.

The contents include the following (among other) important articles:—

THE FREETHOUGHT AND ETHICAL MOVEMENTS IN ENGLAND.

By JOSEPH W. CABE.

FREETHOUGHT AND RELIGION. By CHARLES DAUPRESNE.

THE PROGRAMME OF THE ITALIAN MODERNISTS. By G. DUFROT.

THE WORLD'S PROGRESS: The Future of Religion. By the EDITOR.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE IN ENGLAND. By W. T. STEAD.

A NEW RELIGION: Bahaim. By H. DREYFUS.

FREE.—A copy of No. 1 of "THE INTERNATIONAL" will be sent to any reader of "THE INQUIRER" on receipt of 3d. for postage.

T. FISHER UNWIN, 1, Adelphi Terrace, LONDON.

Schools, etc.

CHANNING HOUSE HIGH SCHOOL AND BOARDING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS. HIGHGATE, LONDON, N. *Head Mistress:* Miss LILIAN TALBOT, B.A. Honours Lond. Preparation for London Matriculation, Trinity College, and Associated Board of Musicians. Healthy situation, Hockey, Cricket, and Swimming. Special terms for daughters of Unitarian ministers. Apply to the HEAD MISTRESS.

WILLASTON SCHOOL, NANTWICH.—The next Entrance Examination will be held at the School on March 31. For particulars of admission on the Foundation, apply to the HEADMASTER.

WEST HEATH SCHOOL, HAMPSHIRE.—Healthy liberal education for Boy and Girls under 14. Boarders and Day-pupils. Illustrated prospectus from the Principals: C. E. RICE, M.A., and Mrs. GARRETT RICE.

MANCHESTER DISTRICT ASSOCIATION OF PRESBYTERIAN AND UNITARIAN CHURCHES. *Annual Meeting, Saturday, March 14th, 1908.*

3.30 p.m.—United Service in Cross Street Chapel, Manchester. Preacher, the Rev. E. W. Sealy, M.A., of Blackburn. Collection in aid of the Funds of the Association.

5.0 p.m.—Tea at Lower Mosley Street Schools, 6d. each.

6.0 p.m.—Evening Meeting in the Memorial Hall, Albert-square. The President, Rev. Charles Peach, in the Chair. Speakers:—Fred Maddison, Esq., M.P., William E. A. Axon, Esq., LL.D.; Revs. W. Copeland Bowie and E. D. Priestley Evans.

District Association Sunday, March 8th. Collections in aid of the Funds of the Association.

NEANDER ANDERTON, } Hon. Secs.
OLIVER H. HEYS, }

Situations, VACANT AND WANTED

TO PARENTS AND GUARDIANS.

KYNOCH LIMITED have VACANCIES in their Commercial Departments for a few YOUNG GENTLEMEN of good Education and Manners. No Premium required. Term of Indentures four years.—Apply by letter only to the Secretary, Kynoch Limited, Witton, Birmingham.

LADY NURSE, experienced, wants post, where there is baby girl preferred.—L., care of Mrs. ELLIS, Little Heath, Potter's Bar.

WANTED, House-Parlourmaid, for quiet house in country (Surrey).—R. A., INQUIRER Office, 3, Essex-street, Strand, W.C.

"UNITY."—Magazine for Unitarian Propaganda. Adopted by churches with or without local page. Issued for last Sunday in each previous month. One copy post free, 1d.—1s. 6d. a year; 9d. per dozen 3s. 6d. per 100; extra charge local page.—Address to EDITOR, The Parsonage, Mottra, Manchester.

NEW SERIES.

UNITARIAN TRACTS.

RECENT ISSUES.

Price 1d. each, by post 1½d.

Unitarianism and "The New Theology." By S. H. MELLONE, M.A., D.Sc.

The Transient and Permanent in Christianity. By THEODORE PARKER.

The Virgin Birth. By CHARLES TRAVERS.

The Miracles of the Bible. By WALTER LLOYD.

Principles of Religion. By AMHERST D. TYSSEN, D.C.L.

Immortal Life. By THEODORE PARKER.

Some Difficulties of Unbelief. By S. FLETCHER WILLIAMS.

Complete List post free on application.

Essex Hall, Essex Street, Strand, W.C.

Board and Residence.

BOURNEMOUTH.—Elvaston, West Cliff, BOARDING ESTABLISHMENT. Unrivalled position on sea front, close to the Highcliffe Hotel. 50 rooms. Full-sized billiard tables. Lovely grounds, with access to Cliff Promenade. Due south. Near Unitarian Church. Illustrated Tariff.—Apply, Mrs. and Mr. Pocock.

ST. LEONARDS-ON-SEA.—"Cranstock," 59, Warrior-square. First-class BOARD AND RESIDENCE; most comfortable throughout. Sea View, excellent cuisine. billiard and smoke room, sanitary certificate.—Mr. and Mrs. SIDNEY P. POTTER.

LANGLEY HOUSE DAWLISH, DEVON.—BOARD AND RESIDENCE for Ladies. Beautiful country. Sea and moorland. Bracing sunny winter resort. Through trains from all parts. Responsible charge taken of the younger guests. Prospectus from PROPRIETOR.

BOARD AND RESIDENCE.—Superior and quiet, for ladies and gentlemen and students.—References exchanged.—Miss PENNY, 18, Bedford-place, Russell-square, London, W.C.

VERY COMFORTABLE HOME for Chronic Patients, with attendance of Nurses. Good rooms. Moderate terms.—Miss FLORENCE BROTHERS, 196, Clapham-road, S.W.

THE SIMPLE LIFE HOME (Sea View), 3, ALBANY ROAD, SOUTHPORT. PRESS OPINIONS.

Sheffield Telegraph: "Imagine a house spaciouly built and furnished with just those things which are needful for health, comfort, and the refinements of existence. Throughout simplicity and exquisite taste."

Manchester City News: "Health and comfort carefully considered."

Millgate Monthly: "Refinement, and the best in art and literature, make it an ideal house. We were amazed at the variety of food."

Sent to WARDEN for Prospectus.

E. Norman Reed & Co.,



Artists
in
Stained
&
Leaded
Glass.

Memorial
Windows

Mosaics.

Church Decorators.

13, Lisle Street, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.
Under the direction of Geo. G. LAIDLER.

CREAM DAMASK BREAKFAST CLOTHS, very dainty and artistic, 42 in. square, only 1/- Your money back if at all dissatisfied. Many other bargains. Lovely patterns post free.—HUTTON'S, 5, Larne, Ireland.

19TH CENTURY BUILDING SOCIETY, ADELAIDE-PLACE, LONDON BRIDGE E.C.

Assets, £167,000.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—Sir H. W. LAWRENCE, Bart., J.P.
Deputy-Chairman—MARK H. JUDGE, A.R.I.B.A.
Miss CECIL GRADWELL, | ALEXANDER W. LAW-
F. H. A. HARDCASTLE, | RENCH.
F.S.I. | Miss ORME.

STEPHEN SEAWARD TAYLER.

A SOUND AND READY MEANS OF INVESTMENT.

PREFERENCE SHARES of £10 each now being issued at 4 per cent. Interest free of Income Tax.

DEPOSITS RECEIVED AT 3 AND 3½ PER CENT. Interest free of Income Tax.

ADVANCES made to buy or build your own house.

Repayments, Survey Fees, and Law Charges low. Prospectus free.

CHARLES A. PRICE, Manager.

Terms for Advertisements.

Advertisements for THE INQUIRER should be addressed to the PUBLISHER, 3, Essex-street, Strand, London, W.C., and should reach the office not later than Twelve o'clock on THURSDAY, to appear the same week. The scale of charges is as follows:—

PER PAGE ...	6 0 0
HALF-PAGE ...	3 0 0
PER COLUMN...	2 0 0
INCH IN COLUMN ...	0 3 6

Special Terms for a Series.

Calendar Notices, 10s. per year, 2 lines.

Births, Marriages, Deaths, 6d. per line. Minimum charge, 1/-

Situations Vacant and Wanted,

20 words, 1s.; every 6 words after, 4d.

3 insertions charged as 2

All payments in respect to THE INQUIRER to be made to E. KENNEDY, 3, Essex-street, Strand, London, W.C. The entire remittance should accompany all orders to insert Advertisements.

Printed by UNWIN BROTHERS, LTD., 27, Pilgrim-street, Ludgate Hill, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors by E. KENNEDY, at the Office, 3, Essex-street, Strand, London, W.C. Sole Agent, JOHN HEYWOOD, 20 to 26, Lamb's Conduit-street, W.C. Manchester (Wholesale), JOHN HEYWOOD, Deansgate.—Saturday, March 7, 1908.